

The seas are quiet when the winds give o'er;
So calm are we when passions are no more:
For then we know how vain it was to boast
Of fleeting things too certain to be lost.
Clouds of affection from our younger eyes,
Conceal that emptiness which age describes.
The soul's dark cottage, battered and decayed,
Lets in new light through chinks that time has made;
Stronger by weakness, wiser men become,
As they draw near to their eternal home,
Leaving the old, both worlds at once they view,
That stand upon the threshold of the new.

Mr. LOWDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that Members desiring to do so may have leave to print.

The SPEAKER. If there be no objection, it will be so ordered.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under the resolution heretofore adopted the House stands adjourned until to-morrow at 11 o'clock.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock p. m.) the House adjourned until Monday, February 18, 1907, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE.

Monday, February 18, 1907.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of Saturday last, when, on request of Mr. SCOTT, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

FINDINGS BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of E. P. Cheroning, administrator of Kelles Cheroning, deceased, *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Loudon Street Presbyterian Church, of Winchester, Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of the Cumberland Presbyterian Church of Mount Comfort, Ark., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Trustees of St. John's Episcopal Church at Charleston, W. Va., *v.* The United States;

In the cause of the Presbyterian Church at Keyser, W. Va., *v.* The United States; and

In the cause of Nathan F. Edmonds, administrator of Henry Show, deceased, *v.* The United States.

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

VISITORS TO NAVAL ACADEMY.

The VICE-PRESIDENT appointed Mr. GALLINGER and Mr. MARTIN members of the Board of Visitors on the part of the Senate to attend the next annual examination of cadets at the Naval Academy at Annapolis, Md., under the requirements of the act approved February 14, 1879.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate relative to the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the Vice-President of the United States in signing the enrolled bill (S. 1160) to correct the military record of John McKinnon, alias John Mack, with an amendment; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1726) entitled "An act making provision for conveying in fee the piece or strip of ground in St. Augustine, Fla., known as 'The Lines,' for school purposes."

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 21944. An act relating to the entry and disposition of certain lands in the State of Nebraska;

H. R. 23391. An act to change the time of holding the United States district and circuit courts in the eastern district of North Carolina, and providing for the appointment of a clerk of the courts at Washington, N. C.;

H. R. 25234. An act permitting the building of a dam across Rock River at Lyndon, Ill.; and

H. R. 25472. An act to fix the limitation applicable in certain cases.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 4403) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903.

The message further transmitted resolutions of the House commemorative of the life and public services of Hon. ROBERT R. HITT, late a Representative from the State of Illinois.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

S. 6691. An act granting to the Columbia Valley Railroad Company a right of way through Fort Columbia Military Reservation, at Scarborough Head, in the State of Washington, and through the United States quarantine station in section 17, township 9 north, range 9 west of Willamette meridian, in said State of Washington, and for other purposes;

S. 7211. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at a point between Kansas City and Sibley, in Jackson County, Mo.," approved March 19, 1904;

S. 7515. An act to authorize the Missouri River Improvement Company, a Montana corporation, to construct a dam or dams across the Missouri River;

S. 8288. An act authorizing and empowering the Secretary of War to locate a right of way for and granting the same and a right to operate and maintain a line of railroad through the Fort Wright Military Reservation, in the State of Washington, to the Portland and Seattle Railway Company, its successors and assigns;

H. R. 1778. An act granting a pension to Jefferson L. Jennings;

H. R. 1887. An act granting a pension to Joseph Brooks;

H. R. 3507. An act to correct the military record of George H. Keating;

H. R. 4678. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Casper;

H. R. 5913. An act granting a pension to Helen Goll;

H. R. 8816. An act granting a pension to Mary Schoske;

H. R. 11535. An act granting a pension to Margarette R. Bacon;

H. R. 14777. An act granting a pension to Mary A. Clark;

H. R. 15189. An act granting an increase of pension to Sidney S. Skinner;

H. R. 15197. An act to correct the military record of Arthur W. White;

H. R. 15353. An act granting an increase of pension to Abbie J. Bryant;

H. R. 15965. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen Gangwer;

H. R. 16020. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Brink;

H. R. 16046. An act granting an increase of pension to David Province;

H. R. 16181. An act granting an increase of pension to Ann Rafferty;

H. R. 16283. An act granting an increase of pension to Archibald H. R. Calvin;

H. R. 16322. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Limpert;

H. R. 16340. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Harris;

H. R. 16389. An act granting a pension to Jefferson Wilcox;

H. R. 16391. An act granting an increase of pension to William Jackson;

H. R. 16458. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel W. Gillam;

H. R. 16487. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha Lavender;

H. R. 16506. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate S. Church;

H. R. 16698. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry H. Davis;

H. R. 16813. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Brumm;

H. R. 16855. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton Peden;

H. R. 16886. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth A. Murrey;

- H. R. 16907. An act granting an increase of pension to Clarke S. Cole;
 H. R. 16978. An act granting an increase of pension to Max Mueller;
 H. R. 17058. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. O'Brien;
 H. R. 17061. An act granting an increase of pension to Iva O. Shepardson;
 H. R. 17204. An act granting a pension to Sarah E. Robey;
 H. R. 17251. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Higgins;
 H. R. 17266. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Alspach;
 H. R. 17330. An act granting an increase of pension to William Tuders;
 H. R. 17331. An act granting an increase of pension to Douglas V. Donnelly;
 H. R. 17334. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Power;
 H. R. 17335. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis F. Belden;
 H. R. 17369. An act granting an increase of pension to Minor B. Monaghan;
 H. R. 17483. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Loyd;
 H. R. 17618. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna F. Burlingame;
 H. R. 17620. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Pendergast, alias Michael Blake;
 H. R. 17634. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Cochran;
 H. R. 17642. An act granting an increase of pension to Roland M. Johnson;
 H. R. 17581. An act granting an increase of pension to Aquilla Williams;
 H. R. 17712. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank J. Biederman;
 H. R. 17750. An act granting an increase of pension to John Gustus;
 H. R. 17783. An act granting an increase of pension to James West;
 H. R. 17817. An act granting an increase of pension to John Grimm;
 H. R. 17831. An act granting an increase of pension to James Bowman;
 H. R. 18014. An act granting an increase of pension to Elbridge P. Boyden;
 H. R. 18042. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Sinclair;
 H. R. 18213. An act granting an increase of pension to William Ingram;
 H. R. 18245. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel D. McCurdy;
 H. R. 18322. An act granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah James;
 H. R. 18323. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard B. Rankin;
 H. R. 18344. An act granting an increase of pension to William Todd;
 H. R. 18383. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Shinaman;
 H. R. 18433. An act granting an increase of pension to William Wentz;
 H. R. 18450. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza Howell;
 H. R. 18602. An act granting an increase of pension to James E. Netser;
 H. R. 18681. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Gray;
 H. R. 18723. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Hanigan;
 H. R. 18881. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander B. Mott;
 H. R. 18968. An act granting a pension to Vance Perkins;
 H. R. 18969. An act granting an increase of pension to Herman Hagemiller;
 H. R. 19042. An act granting a pension to Georgetta K. Col-lum;
 H. R. 19067. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Smith;
 H. R. 19131. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward K. Mull;
 H. R. 19133. An act granting an increase of pension to Fergus P. McMillan;
 H. R. 19175. An act granting an increase of pension to Josiah B. Arnott;
 H. R. 19263. An act granting an increase of pension to John Ingram;
 H. R. 19271. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph J. Branyan;
 H. R. 19294. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Hatten;
 H. R. 19369. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. G. Cliborne;
 H. R. 19384. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan E. Hernandez;
 H. R. 19385. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes E. Calvert;
 H. R. 19400. An act granting an increase of pension to Washington M. Brown;
 H. R. 19401. An act granting an increase of pension to Campbell Cowan;
 H. R. 19450. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Eastep;
 H. R. 19498. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah Neely;
 H. R. 19499. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Milson;
 H. R. 19526. An act granting an increase of pension to Judson H. Holcomb;
 H. R. 19537. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward S. E. Newbury;
 H. R. 19578. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Rogers;
 H. R. 19581. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Bookhammer;
 H. R. 19592. An act granting an increase of pension to William B. Corley;
 H. R. 19613. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Pryce;
 H. R. 19628. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Mooney;
 H. R. 19650. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander W. Taylor;
 H. R. 19706. An act granting an increase of pension to Almon Wood;
 H. R. 19770. An act granting an increase of pension to James G. Van Dewalker;
 H. R. 19775. An act granting an increase of pension to Greenup Meece;
 H. R. 19832. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Smith;
 H. R. 19863. An act granting an increase of pension to Walter B. Swain;
 H. R. 19869. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. Bowles;
 H. R. 19943. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward La Coste;
 H. R. 19969. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry K. Burger;
 H. R. 19976. An act granting a pension to Nelson Isbill;
 H. R. 19994. An act granting a pension to Ritty M. Lane;
 H. R. 20000. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas R. Elliott;
 H. R. 20008. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline A. Smith;
 H. R. 20036. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver T. Westmoreland;
 H. R. 20079. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard F. Barret;
 H. R. 20091. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith;
 H. R. 20107. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Brown;
 H. R. 20125. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Kuchler;
 H. R. 20126. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Pint;
 H. R. 20187. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Duff;
 H. R. 20188. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. McCain, alias John Croft;
 H. R. 20189. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Daniels;
 H. R. 20201. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Airey;
 H. R. 20212. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Green;

- H. R. 20215. An act granting an increase of pension to Riley J. Berkley;
H. R. 20224. An act granting an increase of pension to Philip Hamman;
H. R. 20236. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Richards;
H. R. 20243. An act granting an increase of pension to Anton Heinzen;
H. R. 20244. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred Hayward;
H. R. 20261. An act granting an increase of pension to Burris Subers;
H. R. 20283. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Bole;
H. R. 20291. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Buchanan;
H. R. 20356. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary T. Mathis;
H. R. 20413. An act granting a pension to Eva Louise Eberlin;
H. R. 20446. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Groves;
H. R. 20455. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey McCallin;
H. R. 20493. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles F. Connery;
H. R. 20557. An act granting an increase of pension to Webster Miller;
H. R. 20558. An act granting an increase of pension to Mark W. Terrill;
H. R. 20568. An act granting an increase of pension to Chester R. Pitt;
H. R. 20577. An act granting a pension to Mary Kaisted;
H. R. 20605. An act granting a pension to Mary E. P. Barr;
H. R. 20615. An act granting an increase of pension to Julia T. Baldwin;
H. R. 20616. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Fornwalt;
H. R. 20618. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Brinton;
H. R. 20647. An act granting an increase of pension to Dominick Garvey;
H. R. 20654. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Nichols;
H. R. 20684. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Neal;
H. R. 20685. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph R. Benham;
H. R. 20686. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua S. Jayne;
H. R. 20687. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Dixon;
H. R. 20688. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Storey;
H. R. 20689. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis Doughty;
H. R. 20713. An act granting an increase of pension to Timothy Quinn;
H. R. 20719. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Price;
H. R. 20727. An act granting an increase of pension to William Conwell;
H. R. 20728. An act granting an increase of pension to Ira D. Hill;
H. R. 20729. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Lyons;
H. R. 20730. An act granting an increase of pension to John Carpenter;
H. R. 20731. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter Buchmann;
H. R. 20732. An act granting an increase of pension to Le Roy Benson;
H. R. 20733. An act granting an increase of pension to Oscar Andrews;
H. R. 20734. An act granting an increase of pension to Amos Kellner;
H. R. 20737. An act granting an increase of pension to William G. Whitney;
H. R. 20738. An act granting a pension to Sarah A. Hawkes;
H. R. 20740. An act granting an increase of pension to Guthridge L. Phillips;
H. R. 20821. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Newman;
H. R. 20822. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton L. Howard;
H. R. 20823. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Webb;
H. R. 20831. An act granting an increase of pension to James R. Dunlap;
H. R. 20834. An act granting an increase of pension to Franklin Comstock;
H. R. 20842. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Joyce;
H. R. 20854. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Welch;
H. R. 20855. An act granting an increase of pension to George Hierl, alias George Hill;
H. R. 20856. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine A. Greene;
H. R. 20858. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Thompson;
H. R. 20859. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Hughes;
H. R. 20860. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles T. Chapman;
H. R. 20861. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine Weigert;
H. R. 20862. An act granting an increase of pension to August Weber;
H. R. 20882. An act granting an increase of pension to Luther W. Harris;
H. R. 20887. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma Walters;
H. R. 20929. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas D. King;
H. R. 20930. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Rouge;
H. R. 20931. An act granting an increase of pension to John N. Shear;
H. R. 20953. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Walker;
H. R. 20957. An act granting an increase of pension to William Chagnon;
H. R. 20960. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah M. Bickford;
H. R. 20966. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Jones;
H. R. 20967. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel W. Hines;
H. R. 20970. An act granting an increase of pension to Edgar Weaver;
H. R. 20973. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Luft;
H. R. 21000. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Evans;
H. R. 21002. An act granting an increase of pension to William Wiggins;
H. R. 21022. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas N. Gootee;
H. R. 21025. An act granting an increase of pension to Enoch May;
H. R. 21026. An act granting a pension to Delia S. Humphrey;
H. R. 21039. An act granting an increase of pension to Nelson J. Weller;
H. R. 21046. An act granting a pension to Jesse Harral;
H. R. 21047. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse J. Melton;
H. R. 21060. An act granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Kirchner;
H. R. 21061. An act granting an increase of pension to James Collins;
H. R. 21077. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew M. Dunn;
H. R. 21078. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Davis;
H. R. 21079. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick Kinney;
H. R. 21087. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert Manice;
H. R. 21097. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Martin;
H. R. 21103. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Palmer;
H. R. 21111. An act granting an increase of pension to Arthur Graham;
H. R. 21113. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma M. Chamberlin;
H. R. 21115. An act granting an increase of pension to Sylvester Bickford;

H. R. 21118. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Hartman;
 H. R. 21120. An act granting an increase of pension to John Lynch;
 H. R. 21121. An act granting an increase of pension to Marcus Wood;
 H. R. 21122. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathan Small;
 H. R. 21123. An act granting an increase of pension to Lawrence McHugh;
 H. R. 21133. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Cosgrove;
 H. R. 21134. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Kriner;
 H. R. 21139. An act granting an increase of pension to Willa Fyffe;
 H. R. 21157. An act granting an increase of pension to George C. Peek;
 H. R. 21161. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry J. Rhodes;
 H. R. 21175. An act granting a pension to Martin J. Flagstad;
 H. R. 21227. An act granting an increase of pension to Parthena Lasley;
 H. R. 21238. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Gahan;
 H. R. 21246. An act granting a pension to Margaret Guilroy;
 H. R. 21249. An act granting a pension to Minnie Scheele;
 H. R. 21255. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas McDowell;
 H. R. 21256. An act granting an increase of pension to William Foster;
 H. R. 21257. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Morris;
 H. R. 21258. An act granting an increase of pension to James Dopp;
 H. R. 21264. An act granting an increase of pension to David J. Wise;
 H. R. 21268. An act granting a pension to Rollin S. Belknap;
 H. R. 21270. An act granting an increase of pension to Ellen Sullivan;
 H. R. 21274. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah Buffington;
 H. R. 21276. An act granting an increase of pension to Christian Roessler;
 H. R. 21277. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Martin;
 H. R. 21279. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin Heller;
 H. R. 21280. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac Cain;
 H. R. 21281. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine Ludwig;
 H. R. 21283. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick De Planque;
 H. R. 21289. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Lewis;
 H. R. 21294. An act granting an increase of pension to Lissie D. Allen;
 H. R. 21298. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Pence;
 H. R. 21301. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Goodier;
 H. R. 21303. An act granting an increase of pension to James Edward Bristol;
 H. R. 21312. An act granting an increase of pension to Ernst Boger;
 H. R. 21316. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Rhodes;
 H. R. 21320. An act granting an increase of pension to Ma-linda H. Hitchcock;
 H. R. 21322. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Wilson;
 H. R. 21325. An act granting an increase of pension to George O. Tibbitts;
 H. R. 21331. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert O. Bradley;
 H. R. 21332. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Smith;
 H. R. 21335. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey S. Nettleton;
 H. R. 21343. An act granting an increase of pension to James C. Murray;
 H. R. 21347. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeanette M. Guiney;
 H. R. 21354. An act granting a pension to Mary Shutler;

H. R. 21355. An act granting an increase of pension to John Cooper;
 H. R. 21356. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward C. Miller;
 H. R. 21373. An act granting an increase of pension to Carrie E. Cosgrove;
 H. R. 21374. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Homan;
 H. R. 21375. An act granting an increase of pension to John S. Cornwell;
 H. R. 21376. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Stichter;
 H. R. 21410. An act granting an increase of pension to Blanche M. Kell;
 H. R. 21423. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Wood;
 H. R. 21425. An act granting an increase of pension to Jasper N. Brown;
 H. R. 21426. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Ross;
 H. R. 21427. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Moody;
 H. R. 21428. An act granting an increase of pension to Cornelius H. Lawrence;
 H. R. 21432. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Bragg;
 H. R. 21433. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Lasley;
 H. R. 21446. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Crum;
 H. R. 21448. An act granting an increase of pension to Jesse Jackman;
 H. R. 21461. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Huff;
 H. R. 21462. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Wickham;
 H. R. 21470. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Rebecca Carroll;
 H. R. 21471. An act granting an increase of pension to Adaline H. Malone;
 H. R. 21472. An act granting an increase of pension to Wiley H. Jackson;
 H. R. 21473. An act granting an increase of pension to James B. Wood;
 H. R. 21481. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucy Cole;
 H. R. 21483. An act granting an increase of pension to George S. Woods;
 H. R. 21496. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel B. Davis;
 H. R. 21497. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Hobbs;
 H. R. 21499. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry A. Weiland;
 H. R. 21506. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Howe;
 H. R. 21508. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Barber;
 H. R. 21515. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Wheeler;
 H. R. 21516. An act granting an increase of pension to James Murtha;
 H. R. 21524. An act granting an increase of pension to Elison Gatewood;
 H. R. 21529. An act granting an increase of pension to Charlotte Game;
 H. R. 21532. An act granting an increase of pension to William Dobson;
 H. R. 21534. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Reed;
 H. R. 21535. An act granting an increase of pension to William E. Feeley;
 H. R. 21540. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Wilson;
 H. R. 21542. An act granting an increase of pension to Erastus A. Thomas;
 H. R. 21543. An act granting an increase of pension to Addison Thompson;
 H. R. 21551. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred E. Lucas;
 H. R. 21563. An act granting an increase of pension to Merritt M. Smart;
 H. R. 21564. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel French;

- H. R. 21588. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert Medworth;
H. R. 21603. An act granting an increase of pension to Calvin S. Mullins;
H. R. 21604. An act granting an increase of pension to William Girdler;
H. R. 21606. An act granting an increase of pension to Felix G. Morrison;
H. R. 21612. An act granting an increase of pension to James S. Hart;
H. R. 21615. An act granting an increase of pension to David Yoder;
H. R. 21617. An act granting an increase of pension to William Miller;
H. R. 21618. An act granting an increase of pension to Leonidas W. Reavis;
H. R. 21621. An act granting an increase of pension to Minerva A. Mayes;
H. R. 21624. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Willey;
H. R. 21626. An act granting an increase of pension to Calvin Barker;
H. R. 21630. An act granting an increase of pension to John F. Yeargin;
H. R. 21634. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma Sickler;
H. R. 21636. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias Miller;
H. R. 21643. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Ford;
H. R. 21644. An act granting an increase of pension to Sheldon Hess;
H. R. 21648. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Gaus;
H. R. 21651. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob B. Butts;
H. R. 21660. An act granting an increase of pension to Emma Fehr;
H. R. 21667. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Towle;
H. R. 21718. An act granting an increase of pension to Franz Z. F. W. Jensen;
H. R. 21724. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. Martin;
H. R. 21740. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria R. Klindt;
H. R. 21761. An act granting an increase of pension to John Tims;
H. R. 21764. An act granting an increase of pension to Ment Stannah;
H. R. 21767. An act granting an increase of pension to George Young;
H. R. 21769. An act granting a pension to Emma C. Aikin;
H. R. 21782. An act granting an increase of pension to Anderson Graham;
H. R. 21787. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander Porter;
H. R. 21793. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Pratt;
H. R. 21798. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Spencer;
H. R. 21808. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi Mitchell;
H. R. 21819. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Peach;
H. R. 21832. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Wilkinson;
H. R. 21836. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary C. Hall;
H. R. 21837. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Kasson;
H. R. 21838. An act granting an increase of pension to Fannie J. Terry;
H. R. 21843. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Delaney;
H. R. 21848. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Arthur;
H. R. 21852. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Eaman;
H. R. 21853. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Whitaker;
H. R. 21856. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Viall;
H. R. 21881. An act granting an increase of pension to Mahala M. Jones;
H. R. 21882. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Breazeale;
H. R. 21886. An act granting an increase of pension to John Bryant;
H. R. 21887. An act granting an increase of pension to James H. Hayman;
H. R. 21888. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Canova;
H. R. 21894. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob W. Pierce;
H. R. 21896. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. Field;
H. R. 21906. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Bruder;
H. R. 21909. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. W. Tanner;
H. R. 21913. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Pieper;
H. R. 21915. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Smith;
H. R. 21923. An act granting an increase of pension to Sebastian Fuchs;
H. R. 21960. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah Betts;
H. R. 21961. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey F. Wood;
H. R. 21962. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Osterheld;
H. R. 21988. An act granting a pension to Phillip Dieter;
H. R. 21991. An act granting an increase of pension to Redmond Roche;
H. R. 21997. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha Joyce;
H. R. 22002. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Hall;
H. R. 22003. An act granting an increase of pension to Alexander Matchett;
H. R. 22007. An act granting an increase of pension to Sanford D. Paine;
H. R. 22015. An act granting an increase of pension to William Reese;
H. R. 22017. An act granting an increase of pension to Adolphus Cooley;
H. R. 22018. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Sells;
H. R. 22020. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Keller;
H. R. 22022. An act granting an increase of pension to Josiah H. Shaver;
H. R. 22024. An act granting an increase of pension to Eldridge Underwood;
H. R. 22025. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas H. Cook;
H. R. 22034. An act granting an increase of pension to James A. Wonder;
H. R. 22035. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Swayze;
H. R. 22036. An act granting a pension to Emma A. Hawkes;
H. R. 22039. An act granting a pension to Alethia White;
H. R. 22047. An act granting an increase of pension to George Tinkham;
H. R. 22048. An act granting an increase of pension to Orrin Freeman;
H. R. 22050. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Frost;
H. R. 22065. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Utter;
H. R. 22067. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi E. Miller;
H. R. 22068. An act granting an increase of pension to John P. Macy;
H. R. 22069. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline W. Congdon;
H. R. 22073. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza M. Scott;
H. R. 22079. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Grayson;
H. R. 22085. An act granting an increase of pension to Randolph Wesson;
H. R. 22088. An act granting an increase of pension to Gottlieb Schweizer;
H. R. 22089. An act granting an increase of pension to Adaline G. Bailey;
H. R. 22090. An act granting an increase of pension to Severt Larson;

- H. R. 22092. An act granting an increase of pension to Simon McAteer;
 H. R. 22094. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Hamre;
 H. R. 22099. An act granting an increase of pension to Libbie D. Lowry;
 H. R. 22101. An act granting a pension to Mack Rittenberry;
 H. R. 22102. An act granting an increase of pension to Barre Peterson;
 H. R. 22103. An act granting an increase of pension to Warren P. Hubbs;
 H. R. 22153. An act granting a pension to Antonio Archuleta;
 H. R. 22155. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Armstrong;
 H. R. 22187. An act granting a pension to Hiram C. Jett;
 H. R. 22203. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver J. Burns;
 H. R. 22214. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Prouty;
 H. R. 22215. An act granting an increase of pension to Eliza A. Hughes;
 H. R. 22217. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Boughner;
 H. R. 22222. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Booth;
 H. R. 22223. An act granting an increase of pension to Uriah Kitchen;
 H. R. 22237. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathan Lawson;
 H. R. 22238. An act granting an increase of pension to James Stinson;
 H. R. 22239. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth T. Hayes;
 H. R. 22240. An act granting a pension to James M. Ping;
 H. R. 22241. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen Robinson;
 H. R. 22243. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Campbell;
 H. R. 22252. An act granting an increase of pension to William W. Tyson;
 H. R. 22262. An act granting a pension to Elizabeth S. Osborne;
 H. R. 22264. An act granting an increase of pension to Sibby Barnhill;
 H. R. 22266. An act granting an increase of pension to Delphie Thorne;
 H. R. 22269. An act granting an increase of pension to John L. Rosencrans;
 H. R. 22270. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Hogan;
 H. R. 22272. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Rodefer;
 H. R. 22276. An act granting an increase of pension to Warren A. Sherwood;
 H. R. 22279. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas M. Griffith;
 H. R. 22282. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward H. Lunn;
 H. R. 22284. An act granting an increase of pension to George Ruhle;
 H. R. 22285. An act granting an increase of pension to Dennis Remington, alias John Baker;
 H. R. 22288. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel L. Davis;
 H. R. 22297. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh L. Dicus;
 H. R. 22306. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa Duncan;
 H. R. 22310. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Kerr;
 H. R. 22318. An act granting an increase of pension to James D. Cox;
 H. R. 22322. An act granting an increase of pension to Maria Cross;
 H. R. 22359. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa L. Wood;
 H. R. 22367. An act for the relief of Patrick Conlin;
 H. R. 22376. An act granting an increase of pension to William M. Colby;
 H. R. 22388. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel A. Peabody;
 H. R. 22408. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron Preston;
 H. R. 22409. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret A. McAdoo;
 H. R. 22420. An act granting an increase of pension to Edward Wesley Ward;
 H. R. 22422. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Johnson;
 H. R. 22425. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Sires;
 H. R. 22428. An act granting an increase of pension to Dora T. Bristol;
 H. R. 22431. An act granting an increase of pension to Alden Youngman;
 H. R. 22434. An act granting an increase of pension to Peter McCormick;
 H. R. 22440. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Mose;
 H. R. 22442. An act granting an increase of pension to John Clark;
 H. R. 22443. An act granting an increase of pension to Lyman S. Strickland;
 H. R. 22444. An act granting an increase of pension to William Oliver Anderson;
 H. R. 22447. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Schadler;
 H. R. 22448. An act granting a pension to F. Medora Johnson;
 H. R. 22451. An act granting an increase of pension to John McCaslin;
 H. R. 22452. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Narrin;
 H. R. 22462. An act granting an increase of pension to Aaron Chamberlain;
 H. R. 22500. An act granting an increase of pension to Minor Cleavenger;
 H. R. 22501. An act granting an increase of pension to Austin B. Truman;
 H. R. 22502. An act granting an increase of pension to Oren D. Haskell;
 H. R. 22506. An act granting an increase of pension to James F. Smith;
 H. R. 22522. An act granting an increase of pension to Susan Harroun;
 H. R. 22528. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel Fuller;
 H. R. 22542. An act granting an increase of pension to Charlotte S. O'Neill;
 H. R. 22550. An act granting an increase of pension to Jonathan B. Reber;
 H. R. 22551. An act granting an increase of pension to Wilson Siddell;
 H. R. 22601. An act granting an increase of pension to John J. Clark;
 H. R. 22602. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Passon;
 H. R. 22605. An act granting an increase of pension to John R. Hargrave;
 H. R. 22609. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Bayley;
 H. R. 22620. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles S. Abbott;
 H. R. 22623. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Willison;
 H. R. 22624. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa M. Carothers;
 H. R. 22634. An act granting an increase of pension to Helon Wilson;
 H. R. 22635. An act granting an increase of pension to Catharine Williams;
 H. R. 22642. An act granting an increase of pension to John Gregory;
 H. R. 22651. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah E. Cadmus;
 H. R. 22706. An act granting an increase of pension to William Smoker;
 H. R. 22710. An act granting an increase of pension to Nelson Cornell;
 H. R. 22711. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Kures;
 H. R. 22715. An act granting an increase of pension to Terrence Doyle;
 H. R. 22718. An act granting an increase of pension to William Dean;
 H. R. 22734. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Maier;
 H. R. 22746. An act granting an increase of pension to Felix G. Cobb;
 H. R. 22747. An act granting a pension to Celestia E. Outlaw;

- H. R. 22748. An act granting an increase of pension to Willard P. Fisher;
 H. R. 22749. An act granting an increase of pension to Della S. Easton;
 H. R. 22750. An act granting an increase of pension to William Jenkins;
 H. R. 22756. An act granting an increase of pension to Levi E. Curtis;
 H. R. 22757. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua E. Hyatt;
 H. R. 22762. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Gilbert;
 H. R. 22764. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel V. Carr;
 H. R. 22766. An act granting an increase of pension to Soren V. Kalsem;
 H. R. 22771. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Courter;
 H. R. 22772. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary S. Sanders;
 H. R. 22776. An act granting an increase of pension to James E. Converse;
 H. R. 22820. An act granting an increase of pension to George S. Schmutz;
 H. R. 22827. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Kirk;
 H. R. 22829. An act granting an increase of pension to George Spalding;
 H. R. 22838. An act granting an increase of pension to W. Ira Templeton;
 H. R. 22842. An act granting an increase of pension to William C. Hodges;
 H. R. 22846. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin Holmes, alias George Langin;
 H. R. 22853. An act granting an increase of pension to Burden H. Barrett;
 H. R. 22858. An act granting an increase of pension to John A. Henry;
 H. R. 22881. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas L. Williams;
 H. R. 22926. An act granting a pension to Louisa Bartlett;
 H. R. 22927. An act granting an increase of pension to William A. Leach;
 H. R. 22929. An act granting an increase of pension to John O. McNabb;
 H. R. 22941. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucinda Davidson;
 H. R. 22951. An act granting an increase of pension to Alice E. Ragan;
 H. R. 22976. An act granting an increase of pension to Milton Stevens;
 H. R. 22978. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Adams;
 H. R. 22985. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Bauerlin;
 H. R. 22990. An act granting an increase of pension to Francis A. Lander;
 H. R. 22993. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily Hibernia Trabue;
 H. R. 22994. An act granting an increase of pension to Lucinda C. Musgrove;
 H. R. 22995. An act granting an increase of pension to Nathaniel Y. Buck;
 H. R. 23036. An act granting an increase of pension to John C. Mitchell;
 H. R. 23051. An act granting an increase of pension to Volna S. Topping;
 H. R. 23057. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Davidson;
 H. R. 23096. An act granting an increase of pension to James L. Colding;
 H. R. 23121. An act granting an increase of pension to Frank Vroman;
 H. R. 23122. An act granting an increase of pension to Melissa D. Whitman;
 H. R. 23133. An act granting an increase of pension to John Cowan;
 H. R. 23135. An act granting a pension to Roseanna King;
 H. R. 23136. An act granting an increase of pension to Sylvanus Sloat;
 H. R. 23143. An act granting an increase of pension to John H. Robbins;
 H. R. 23153. An act granting an increase of pension to George Quien;
 H. R. 23166. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Voris;
 H. R. 23171. An act granting an increase of pension to Harmon Veatch;
 H. R. 23182. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha Ella Wrenn;
 H. R. 23187. An act granting a pension to Jennie E. Luckenbach;
 H. R. 23195. An act granting an increase of pension to Aurora Garwood Ellis;
 H. R. 23197. An act granting an increase of pension to Agnes E. Brown;
 H. R. 23234. An act granting an increase of pension to James W. Walsh, alias James Powers;
 H. R. 23241. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Loomis;
 H. R. 23247. An act granting an increase of pension to George I. Stults;
 H. R. 23250. An act granting a pension to George A. Mercer;
 H. R. 23263. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael Downs;
 H. R. 23265. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Helton;
 H. R. 23278. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Morris;
 H. R. 23279. An act granting an increase of pension to David H. Moore;
 H. R. 23281. An act granting an increase of pension to William T. Fisher;
 H. R. 23299. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Goodlander;
 H. R. 23327. An act granting an increase of pension to Paul Sheets;
 H. R. 23339. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha L. Burnham;
 H. R. 23357. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Houston;
 H. R. 23365. An act granting an increase of pension to William Seitz;
 H. R. 23367. An act granting an increase of pension to Asa A. Gardner;
 H. R. 23371. An act granting an increase of pension to Clark Crecelius;
 H. R. 23423. An act granting an increase of pension to Elbridge Simpson;
 H. R. 23458. An act granting an increase of pension to Edgar D. Ellis;
 H. R. 23468. An act granting an increase of pension to Martin Becker;
 H. R. 23475. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Green;
 H. R. 23477. An act granting an increase of pension to Caroline Vick;
 H. R. 23481. An act granting an increase of pension to John G. Price;
 H. R. 23495. An act granting an increase of pension to Adam Sliger;
 H. R. 23522. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Shacklett;
 H. R. 23526. An act granting an increase of pension to Stephen D. Jordan;
 H. R. 23527. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph E. Knighten;
 H. R. 23528. An act granting an increase of pension to John M. Smith;
 H. R. 23549. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaiah Carter;
 H. R. 23550. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth C. Smith;
 H. R. 23593. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Buck;
 H. R. 23599. An act granting an increase of pension to Alfred B. Stansil;
 H. R. 23608. An act granting an increase of pension to John Manley;
 H. R. 23622. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin Maple;
 H. R. 23624. An act granting an increase of pension to Albina M. Williams;
 H. R. 23644. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles J. Schreiner;
 H. R. 23645. An act granting an increase of pension to Isaac L. Griswold;

H. R. 23651. An act granting an increase of pension to John W. Wilson;
 H. R. 23652. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Zimmerman;
 H. R. 23653. An act granting an increase of pension to Dewitt C. Chapman;
 H. R. 23656. An act granting an increase of pension to John Kilpatrick;
 H. R. 23683. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Phillips;
 H. R. 23684. An act granting an increase of pension to Harry C. Cadwell;
 H. R. 23686. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Kehlbeck;
 H. R. 23687. An act granting a pension to Blanche C. Polk;
 H. R. 23699. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Countryman;
 H. R. 23703. An act granting an increase of pension to Clarendon Kelly;
 H. R. 23705. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick P. Gaudineer;
 H. R. 23739. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Pillow;
 H. R. 23762. An act granting an increase of pension to Adelaide Wagner;
 H. R. 23764. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph C. Fisher;
 H. R. 23770. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Combs;
 H. R. 23772. An act granting an increase of pension to Temperance Davis;
 H. R. 23774. An act granting an increase of pension to James Kelley;
 H. R. 23777. An act granting an increase of pension to James Marshall;
 H. R. 23778. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Clapper;
 H. R. 23781. An act granting an increase of pension to Honora Higgins;
 H. R. 23783. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Buzzell;
 H. R. 23792. An act granting an increase of pension to Zeurial McCulloch;
 H. R. 23795. An act granting an increase of pension to Patrick McMahon;
 H. R. 23803. An act granting an increase of pension to David C. Jones;
 H. R. 23804. An act granting an increase of pension to Phoebe E. Sparkman;
 H. R. 23805. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas Hamilton;
 H. R. 23810. An act granting an increase of pension to Ira J. Everson;
 H. R. 23811. An act granting an increase of pension to Theron Cross;
 H. R. 23812. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph Dewhurst;
 H. R. 23845. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Cassle;
 H. R. 23846. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah Ann Kendig;
 H. R. 23858. An act granting an increase of pension to Hugh M. Cox;
 H. R. 23870. An act granting an increase of pension to America J. Austin;
 H. R. 23872. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Blacker;
 H. R. 23874. An act granting an increase of pension to William R. Horn;
 H. R. 23877. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Edwards;
 H. R. 23899. An act granting an increase of pension to James P. Hanna;
 H. R. 23915. An act granting a pension to William Stegal;
 H. R. 23957. An act granting an increase of pension to John Heinrichs;
 H. R. 23958. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Parson;
 H. R. 23969. An act granting an increase of pension to William Morson;
 H. R. 23973. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Looer Reger;
 H. R. 23981. An act granting an increase of pension to Sarah Elizabeth Fuller;

H. R. 23984. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Miller;
 H. R. 24017. An act granting an increase of pension to Timothy Hanlon;
 H. R. 24018. An act granting an increase of pension to John Adams Miller;
 H. R. 24019. An act granting an increase of pension to John Brown;
 H. R. 24023. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Clark;
 H. R. 24056. An act granting an increase of pension to Reuben Copher;
 H. R. 24064. An act granting a pension to Mary Murray;
 H. R. 24078. An act granting an increase of pension to Warren J. Sevey;
 H. R. 24096. An act granting an increase of pension to Oscar F. Peacock;
 H. R. 24099. An act granting an increase of pension to Benjamin J. Puckett;
 H. R. 24155. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard N. Porter;
 H. R. 24182. An act granting an increase of pension to John Delaney;
 H. R. 24185. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Weller;
 H. R. 24187. An act granting an increase of pension to Nancy G. Reid;
 H. R. 24188. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Moore;
 H. R. 24192. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Lee;
 H. R. 24208. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert Sunderland;
 H. R. 24214. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Hodge;
 H. R. 24231. An act granting an increase of pension to Abigail S. Sibley;
 H. R. 24259. An act granting an increase of pension to Hannibal A. Johnson;
 H. R. 24268. An act granting an increase of pension to Louisa Olin;
 H. R. 24303. An act granting an increase of pension to Gilliam M. Ezell;
 H. R. 24321. An act granting an increase of pension to Belah H. Wilcox;
 H. R. 24323. An act granting an increase of pension to Talcott M. Brown;
 H. R. 24360. An act granting an increase of pension to Jeremiah F. Pittman;
 H. R. 24380. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Woodruff Woolley;
 H. R. 24383. An act granting an increase of pension to Shadrack H. J. Alley;
 H. R. 24415. An act granting an increase of pension to Laura G. Hight;
 H. R. 24418. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate Flowers;
 H. R. 24479. An act granting an increase of pension to Simeon D. Pope;
 H. R. 24513. An act granting an increase of pension to Bowman H. Buck;
 H. R. 24616. An act granting an increase of pension to Mathias Shirk;
 H. R. 24620. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth Balew; and
 H. R. 24671. An act granting an increase of pension to Augustine Sorrell.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a joint resolution of the legislature of the State of Wisconsin, in favor of the enactment of legislation to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service thereon; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution asking for the passage by Congress of S. 5133, "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service thereon."

Whereas on January 11, 1907, there was reported in the House of Representatives of the United States an act passed by the Senate of the United States (S. 5133), "An act to promote the safety of employees and travelers upon railroads by limiting the hours of service thereon;" and

Whereas the interests of travelers upon the railroads of the United States and the employees thereon will be promoted by the speedy enactment of this measure into law: Be it

Resolved by the assembly (the senate concurring), That the Representatives in Congress from the State of Wisconsin are requested to

use their votes and influence to secure an immediate favorable report upon and the passage of said act; and it is

Ordered, That one copy of this resolution be sent to the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the United States, one copy to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of said House, and one copy to each Member of Congress from the State of Wisconsin.

H. L. EKEM,
Speaker of the Assembly.
W. D. CONNOR,
President of the Senate.

C. E. SHAFFER,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
A. R. EMERSON,
Chief Clerk of the Senate.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented a petition of sundry citizens of Bangor, Mich., and a petition of the congregation of the Waverly Baptist Church, of Waverly, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the St. Joseph Benevolent Organization, of Indianapolis, Ind., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to permit the manufacture by consumers of denatured alcohol in small quantities; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of the National Benevolent Societies of Philadelphia, Pa., praying for the appointment of a commission to investigate the entire question of immigration; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Wisconsin, New York, Michigan, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, Illinois, Iowa, Indiana, Minnesota, Texas, Maryland, Missouri, Florida, Texas, Kansas, Kentucky, Georgia, Rhode Island, Massachusetts, and North Carolina, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented the petition of Charles Raynard, of Santa Rosalia Heights, Isle of Pines, praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the separation of the Isle of Pines from the governmental control of the island of Cuba; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of the Woman's Christian Temperance unions of Deercreek, Westfield, Deputy, and Richmond, all in the State of Indiana, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KEAN presented a petition of the executive committee of the Oystermen's Protective Association of the State of New York, forwarded by the J. & J. W. Elsworth Company, of Keyport, N. J., in regard to the operation of the new pure-food law upon the transportation of oysters; which was referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

Mr. PLATT presented petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, Mechanicsville, Binghamton, Laurel Hill, and New York City, all in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present denatured-alcohol law; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyrights; which were referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. SCOTT presented a petition of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Clay, W. Va., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McLAURIN presented the petition of Mrs. M. Jackson, of Ennis, Miss., and 510 other women of the State of Mississippi, praying for an investigation of the charges made and filed against Hon. REED SMOOT, a Senator from the State of Utah; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. ALLEE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Dover, McClellandsville, and Laurel, all in the State of Delaware, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. ANKENY presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Washington and Idaho, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation requiring certain places of business in the District of Columbia to be closed on Sunday; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. BURKETT. I present petitions from several thousand blind petitioners and several thousand sympathizers in the country, praying for the enactment of legislation to allow free

postage on reading matter for the blind. I move that the petitions be referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. BURKETT presented the petition of Mrs. T. M. Southard, of St. Paul, Nebr., praying for the enactment of legislation to increase the pensions of widows of soldiers; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. DEPEW presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of New York, remonstrating against the passage of the so-called "free leaf-tobacco bill;" which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of New York City and Hastings upon Hudson, in the State of New York, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present denatured-alcohol law; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Shortsville, Sherman, Tyrone, Altamont, Gorham, Holly, Onondaga Valley, Gainesville, Dryden, West Winfield, Newark, and Halley, all in the State of New York, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CURTIS presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Kansas, in favor of the present pension laws being extended to the Kansas State Militia; which was referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a concurrent resolution of the legislature of the State of Kansas, in favor of an appropriation for the improvement of the Mississippi and other rivers of the country; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petition of sundry citizens of Norton, Kans., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. KITTREDGE. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A joint resolution and memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to make Fort Meade, S. Dak., a brigade post, with permanent brick or stone barracks, officers' quarters, and other buildings.

Be it resolved by the senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas Fort Meade is centrally located with reference to all the Indian reservations in North and South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming, upon which reservations there are quartered about 40,000 uncivilized Indians; and

Whereas Fort Meade is the only military post in South Dakota and the only post in the whole Northwest possessing the required strategic advantages to exercise surveillance over the Indians and afford proper protection to the property and people of this rich and rapidly developing country (troops from this post having recently captured the roving Ute Indians in Montana and now have them quartered at Fort Meade); and

Whereas the lines of railroad now in operation and nearing completion will offer transportation facilities over four lines in four different directions, forming a basis for military movements, enabling troops to quickly reach any point of trouble; and

Whereas Fort Meade has a large timber reservation within the Black Hills Forest Reserve upon which there is pine timber and an abundant supply of pure mountain spring water, and also a military reservation, 2 miles by 6 miles in area, with all available adjoining land needed for the requirements of a brigade post, which, collectively, would include the level and rolling prairie, open and wooded streams of water, bluffs and brakes, bare hills and timbered mountains, offering all practical varieties of country for maneuvers; and

Whereas the hospital record shows that the pure, malaria-free, bracing climate renders Fort Meade the healthiest post garrisoned in America; and

Whereas Fort Meade is in process of rebuilding, as a two-squadron cavalry post, there having been built in the past six years brick and stone barracks for eight troops, hospital, post exchange, line and field officers' quarters, noncommissioned officers' quarters, bakery, powder magazine, stables, fire station, water system and concrete reservoir, sewer system and stable drain, macadamized roads and cement walks, electric-light wiring, and other permanent improvements modern and up to date, and costing over \$600,000: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we favor and earnestly urge the Congress of the United States by proper enactment to designate Fort Meade as a brigade post and provide for the erection of additional barracks, quarters, and other structures ample and suitable for the proper garrison thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to employ their best efforts to compass this end.

[Indorsed.]

A joint resolution and memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to make Fort Meade, S. Dak., a brigade post, with permanent brick or stone barracks, officers' quarters, and other buildings.

M. J. CHANEY,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:
JAMES W. COXE,
Chief Clerk.
HOWARD C. SHOBER,
President of the Senate.

Attest:
L. M. SIMONS,
Secretary of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within resolution originated in the senate and was known in the senate files as senate joint resolution No. 6.

L. M. SIMONS, *Secretary.*

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, OFFICE SECRETARY OF STATE, ss:

Filed February 12, 1907, at 3.50 o'clock p. m.

D. D. WIPF,
Secretary of State.

By E. A. PLATTS,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. KITTREDGE. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of South Dakota, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

The joint resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota:*

I, D. D. Wipf, secretary of state of South Dakota and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 14 as passed by the tenth legislative assembly of the State of South Dakota, now in session, and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota. Done at the city of Pierre this 13th day of February, 1907.

[SEAL.]

D. D. WIPF,
Secretary of State.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to pass an act removing the restrictions upon the manufacture of denatured alcohol for mechanical and illuminating purposes.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to remove all restrictions which will tend to prevent the domestic manufacture of denatured alcohol to be used exclusively for mechanical purposes, fuel, or lights.

SEC. 2. That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the chief clerk to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives of South Dakota in Congress.

[Indorsed.]

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to pass an act removing the restrictions upon the manufacture of denatured alcohol for mechanical and illuminating purposes.

M. J. CHANEY,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:
JAMES W. CONE, *Chief Clerk.*

HOWARD C. SHOBER,
President of the Senate.

Attest:
L. M. SIMONS, *Secretary of the Senate.*

I hereby certify that the within joint resolution originated in the house of representatives and was known in the house files as "Joint resolution No. 14."

JAMES W. CONE, *Chief Clerk.*

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, OFFICE SECRETARY OF STATE, ss:

Filed February 12, 1907, at 3.50 o'clock p. m.

D. D. WIPF,
Secretary of State.
By E. A. PLATTS,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. PERKINS presented a petition of Sutter Lodge, No. 340, Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen, of Sacramento, Cal., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the granting of restraining orders in certain cases; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Hemet and San Marcos, in the State of California, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GAMBLE. I present a joint resolution of the legislature of the State of South Dakota, in favor of the establishment of Fort Meade, S. Dak., as a brigade post. I ask that the joint resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, as follows:

A joint resolution and memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to make Fort Meade, S. Dak., a brigade post, with permanent brick or stone barracks, officers' quarters, and other buildings.

Be it resolved by the senate of the State of South Dakota (the house of representatives concurring):

Whereas Fort Meade is centrally located with reference to all the Indian reservations in North and South Dakota, Montana, and Wyoming, upon which reservations there are quartered about 40,000 uncivilized Indians; and

Whereas Fort Meade is the only military post in South Dakota and the only post in the whole Northwest possessing the required strategic advantages to exercise surveillance over the Indians and afford proper protection to the property and people of this rich and rapidly developing country (troops from this post having recently captured the roving Ute Indians in Montana and now have them quartered at Fort Meade); and

Whereas the lines of railroad now in operation and nearing completion will offer transportation facilities over four lines in four different directions, forming a basis for military movements enabling troops to quickly reach any point of trouble; and

Whereas Fort Meade has a large timber reservation, within the Black Hills Forest Reserve, upon which there is pine timber and an abundant supply of pure mountain spring water, and also a military reservation, 2 miles by 6 miles in area, with all available adjoining land needed for the requirements of a brigade post, which collectively would include the level and rolling prairie, open and wooded streams of water, bluffs and brakes, bare hills and timbered mountains, offering all practical varieties of country for maneuvers; and

Whereas the hospital record shows that the pure, malaria-free, bracing climate renders Fort Meade the healthiest post garrisoned in America; and

Whereas Fort Meade is in process of rebuilding as a two-squadron cavalry post, there having been built in the past six years brick and stone barracks for eight troops, hospital, post exchange, line and field officers' quarters, noncommissioned officers' quarters, bakery, powder magazine, stables, fire station, water system and concrete reservoir, sewer system and stable drain, macadamized roads and cement walks, electric-light wiring, and other permanent improvements, modern and up to date and costing over \$600,000: Therefore, be it

Resolved, That we favor and earnestly urge the Congress of the United States, by proper enactment, to designate Fort Meade as a brigade post and provide for the erection of additional barracks, quarters, and other structures, ample and suitable for the proper garrison thereof; and be it further

Resolved, That we request our Senators and Representatives in Congress to employ their best efforts to compass this end.

[Indorsed.]

A joint resolution and memorial requesting the Congress of the United States to make Fort Meade, S. Dak., a brigade post, with permanent brick or stone barracks, officers' quarters, and other buildings.

M. J. CHANEY,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:
JAMES W. CONE, *Chief Clerk.*

HOWARD C. SHOBER,
President of the Senate.

Attest:
L. M. SIMONS, *Secretary of the Senate.*

I hereby certify that the within resolution originated in the senate and was known in the senate files as senate joint resolution No. 6.

L. M. SIMONS, *Secretary.*

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, Office Secretary of State, ss:

Filed February 12, 1907, at 3.50 o'clock p. m.

D. D. WIPF,
Secretary of State.
By E. A. PLATTS,
Assistant Secretary.

Mr. GAMBLE. I present a joint resolution of the State of South Dakota, in favor of the enactment of legislation removing the restrictions upon the manufacture of denatured alcohol for mechanical and illuminating purposes. I ask that the joint resolution be read, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the joint resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
SECRETARY'S OFFICE.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, *State of South Dakota:*

I, D. D. Wipf, secretary of state of South Dakota, and keeper of the great seal thereof, do hereby certify that the attached instrument of writing is a true and correct copy of house joint resolution No. 14, as passed by the tenth legislative assembly of the State of South Dakota, now in session, and of the whole thereof, and has been compared with the original now on file in this office.

In testimony whereof I have hereunto set my hand and affixed the great seal of the State of South Dakota, done at the city of Pierre this 13th day of February, 1907.

[SEAL.]

D. D. WIPF,
Secretary of State.

A joint resolution memorializing Congress to pass an act removing the restrictions upon the manufacture of denatured alcohol for mechanical and illuminating purposes.

Be it resolved by the house of representatives of the State of South Dakota (the senate concurring):

SECTION 1. That we respectfully petition the Congress of the United States to remove all restrictions which will tend to prevent the domestic manufacture of denatured alcohol to be used exclusively for mechanical purposes, fuel, and lights.

SEC. 2. That a copy of these resolutions be forwarded by the chief clerk to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the House of Representatives, and to each of the Senators and Representatives of South Dakota in Congress.

M. J. CHANEY,
Speaker of the House.

Attest:
JAMES W. CONE, *Chief Clerk.*
HOWARD C. SHOBER, *President of the Senate.*

Attest:
L. M. SIMONS, *Secretary of the Senate.*

I hereby certify that the within joint resolution originated in the house of representatives, and was known in the house files as "joint resolution No. 14."

JAMES W. CONE, *Chief Clerk.*

STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, OFFICE SECRETARY OF STATE, ss:

Filed February 12, 1907, at 3.50 o'clock p. m.

D. D. WIPF, *Secretary of State.*
By E. A. PLATTS, *Assistant Secretary.*

Mr. GALLINGER presented a petition of sundry citizens of Newport, N. H., and a petition of sundry citizens of Nashua, N. H., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Takoma Park Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enact-

ment of legislation to suppress the smoke nuisance in the District of Columbia arising from the use of soft coal in locomotives; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

He also presented a petition of the Takoma Park Citizens' Association, of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation to limit the hours of labor of railroad employees; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Retail Grocers' Association of the District of Columbia, praying for the enactment of legislation governing the maintenance of stock yards, slaughterhouses, and packing houses in the District of Columbia; which was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Mr. TILLMAN presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Sumter, S. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for a national reciprocal demurrage law penalizing railroads for neglecting to perform their duty as common carriers of freight; which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented the petition of Charles S. Bundy, of Washington, D. C., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the establishment of a public park on Meridian Hill in the District of Columbia; which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. RAYNER presented petitions of the Baltimore-Maryland Engraving Company, of the Main Furniture Company, of the Reinle Salmon Company, of Maryland; of C. Glaser, of Baltimore; of the Furniture Manufacturing Company of Easton, and of Loiuson & Zenitz, of Baltimore, all in the State of Maryland, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present denatured-alcohol law; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HOPKINS presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Dekalb, and Batavia, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present denatured-alcohol law; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Chicago and Peoria, in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against the enactment of any legislation conferring upon the Secretary of Agriculture the right to fix certain food standards; which were referred to the Committee on Manufactures.

He also presented petitions of the International Association of Car Workers; of the United Garment Workers of America, all of the American Federation of Labor; of the Johnson Chair Company, and of the Kinley Manufacturing Company, of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation providing for the protection of labor and industries from competition with convict labor and prison-made goods; which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also presented a petition of 61 citizens of El Paso, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. PENROSE presented memorials of George Smith Post, No. 79, Grand Army of the Republic, Conshohocken; Colonel Gus W. Town Post, Philadelphia; Colonel James Ashworth Post, No. 334, Frankford, Philadelphia; Sanford F. Beyer Post, No. 426, Bellwood; J. K. Taylor Post, No. 182, Bethlehem; Yeager Post, No. 13, Allentown; Anna M. Ross Post, No. 94, Philadelphia; General Hector Tyndale Post, No. 160, Philadelphia; Lieutenant Ezra S. Griffin Post, No. 139, Scranton; Colonel Fred Taylor Post, No. 19, Philadelphia; Lieutenant David H. Wilson Post, No. 134, Millintown; Captain Walter S. Newhall Post, No. 7, Philadelphia, and The Naval Post, No. 400, Philadelphia; Lieutenant Josiah White Post, No. 45, Grand Army of the Republic, Phoenixville; Colonel Croasdale Post, Grand Army of the Republic, Reigelsville; Colonel Ellsworth Post, No. 209, Scottsdale; Major William H. Byers Post, No. 612, Beaver Springs; Robert Oldham Post, No. 527, South Bethlehem; C. S. Davis Post, No. 148, Selinsgrove; General Alex. Hays Post, No. 3, Pittsburg; Henry Wilson Post, No. 129, Milton; George G. Meade Post, No. 1, Philadelphia; Keim Post, No. 76, Reading; Perkins Post, No. 202, Athens; John D. Bertollette Post, No. 484, Lehigh, and J. W. Reynolds Post, No. 98, Tunkhannock, all of the State of Pennsylvania, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to abolish the pension agencies throughout the country; which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. WARREN presented petitions of the congregations of the First Methodist Episcopal Church, the First Congregational Church, and the Baptist Church, and of sundry citizens, all of Cheyenne, in the State of Wyoming, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of

intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to further restrict immigration; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Methodist Ministers' Association, New Haven district, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to prohibit the sale of intoxicating liquors in all Government buildings and grounds; which was referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

He also presented a memorial of the Mannerchor and German Verein of Taftville, Conn., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the Methodist Ministers' Association, New Haven district, of New Britain, Conn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of the Board of Trade of St. Paul, Minn., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present public-land laws; which was referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

He also presented a petition of the Board of Trade of St. Paul, Minn., praying that an appropriation be made for deepening the channel of the upper Mississippi River; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Minneapolis, Minn., praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present denatured-alcohol law; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Mrs. J. W. Garr, of Hewitt, Minn., praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SIMMONS presented a petition of the Charlotte Casket Company, of Charlotte, N. C., and a petition of the National Furniture Company, of North Carolina, praying for the adoption of certain amendments to the present denatured-alcohol law; which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. HEYBURN presented a petition of Typographical Union No. 271 of Boise City, Idaho, praying for the enactment of legislation to amend and consolidate the acts respecting copyrights; which was referred to the Committee on Patents.

Mr. McCREARY presented petitions of sundry citizens of Vanceburg and Madisonville, in the State of Kentucky, praying for the enactment of legislation to regulate the interstate transportation of intoxicating liquors; which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I present a concurrent resolution of the legislature of North Dakota, in favor of the repeal of the tariff on lumber and coal and fuel. I ask that the concurrent resolution be read, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.

[A substitute offered by the senate for house concurrent resolution.—Introduced by Mr. Grant.]

Whereas it is currently reported, generally understood, and manifestly apparent to everyone that there is a combination in restraint of trade between the dealers in coal and fuel and the dealers in lumber in the State of North Dakota and elsewhere; and

Whereas said combination is now resulting in material injury to the people of the State of North Dakota, is retarding the building and erection of homes, and exacting from the people of the State of North Dakota unjust tribute to this unlawful combination: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the senate (the house of representatives concurring), That the Senators and Representatives from this State now in the Congress of the United States are hereby requested to use their earnest endeavors and all honorable means to secure the repeal of the tariff on lumber and coal and fuel now in existence between the United States and the provinces of Canada.

Resolved further, That the secretary of state be, and hereby is, requested to forward to His Excellency President Theodore Roosevelt, and to the Hon. H. C. HANSBROUGH, Hon. PORTER J. MCCUMBER, Hon. THOMAS F. MARSHALL, and Hon. A. J. GRONNA certified copies of these resolutions.

TREADWELL TWICHELL,
Speaker of the House.

P. D. NORTON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

R. S. LEWIS,
President of the Senate.

JAMES W. FOLEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

I, P. D. Norton, chief clerk of the house, do hereby certify that the foregoing concurrent resolution is a substitute offered by the senate for house concurrent resolution, and that the same was passed by the

senate on January 31, 1907, and concurred in by the house of representatives of the tenth legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota on February 8, 1907.

P. D. NORTON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I present concurrent resolution of the legislature of North Dakota, relative to the conversion of the waste and other products of the farm into denatured alcohol for use as light, heat, and power. I ask that the concurrent resolution be read and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.
[Introduced by Mr. Buttz.]

Whereas the construction placed upon the law passed at the last session of the Congress of the United States and known as "the denatured-alcohol law" by the Internal-Revenue Bureau is such that it is difficult to convert the waste and other products of the farm into denatured alcohol for use as light, heat, and power; and

Whereas there is now pending in said Congress of the United States an amendment to said law which, if passed, will permit the conversion of these wastes and other products of the farm into denatured alcohol at small expense to the producer thereof: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota, That our representatives in Congress be, and they are hereby, requested to do all in their power to secure the enactment of said amendment into law; and be it

Further resolved, That the secretary of state be, and he is hereby, requested to forward a certified copy of this resolution to each of the Members of Congress from this State.

TREADWELL TWICHELL,
Speaker of the House.
P. D. NORTON,
Chief Clerk of the House.
R. S. LEWIS,
President of the Senate.
JAMES W. FOLEY,
Secretary of the Senate.

I hereby certify that the within concurrent resolution originated and was adopted on January 21, 1907, by the house of representatives of the tenth legislative assembly of the State of North Dakota, and was on January 29, 1907, duly concurred in by the senate.

P. D. NORTON,
Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I present a concurrent resolution of the legislature of North Dakota, relative to the value of the waters of the upper Missouri and Yellowstone rivers for navigation purposes. I ask that the concurrent resolution be read, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION.
[Offered by Mr. Chapman.]

Whereas the honorable chairman of the Rivers and Harbors Committee of the House of Representatives is laboring under misapprehension or ill advice as to the volume of water therein, and the value of the upper Missouri and Yellowstone rivers for navigation purposes; and

Whereas the volume of traffic on both of the navigable streams north of the forty-sixth parallel will continue to increase with the now rapidly increasing immigration and the wonderful development of the country tributary to said rivers, incident to the completion of the irrigation ditches along said rivers, now under construction by the United States: Now, therefore, be it—

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President, I do not know what jurisdiction the Senate has over matters of this kind, but it is clearly out of order to have any communication presented here in the nature of a statement of the character of that which is contained in the first part of the memorial of the legislature of North Dakota which the Secretary has proceeded to read.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from North Dakota asked that the memorial might be read.

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I will state that it is a concurrent resolution passed by the legislature of the sovereign State of North Dakota; and under the unwritten rule of this Senate it is entitled to be read at the desk and inserted in the Record.

Mr. ALDRICH. I will say to the Senator that the State of North Dakota may be sovereign in its own jurisdiction and within its own limits, but it certainly has no right to send a communication here reflecting upon an officer or a Member of the other House. At least, I am sure we have the right, if such a communication is sent here, to not receive it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the further reading of the concurrent resolution in the nature of a memorial?

Mr. HALE. I would inquire, Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota has had his attention called to the rule that no reference shall be made here in any way to any Member of the other House or to its action?

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I am entirely familiar with the rule, Mr. President. I was not aware, however, that there was anything in the resolution that reflected on any Member of the other House. If there is such a thing, I shall, of course, be very glad for the time being to withdraw the resolution.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution is withdrawn.

Mr. CULBERSON. I present a concurrent resolution of the legislature of Texas, in favor of the enactment of legislation relative to certain trade arrangements or agreements with foreign nations as will afford the best possible market for live stock and its products, etc. I ask that the concurrent resolution be read, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

There being no objection, the concurrent resolution was read, and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

RESOLUTION.

[By Bryan, Duncan, and Pool.]

Resolved by the house of representatives (the senate concurring), That

Whereas the live-stock producing interests of the United States are suffering material loss by reason of the fact that they are practically deprived of access to the markets of continental Europe for the sale of live stock and the products of live stock; and

Whereas there is no provision of law authorizing the administrative departments of the Government of the United States to make any trade agreement with foreign nations favorable to an extension of our foreign trade in live stock and the products of live stock, as well as other products of the farm and ranch; and

Whereas it is the belief of the farmers and live-stock raisers of this country that it is competent for Congress to pass a law or laws which will empower the President of the United States, as a consideration for trade agreements with foreign countries, to grant such concessions in the schedules of tariff on articles imported or to be imported from such foreign countries into the United States as will enable this Government to make trade agreements which will admit the products of commerce of such foreign countries into this country and the products of the farms and ranches of this country into such foreign countries without unreasonable restrictions; and

Whereas we believe that the foreign trade in the products of the farms and ranches of this country has been sacrificed by the inauguration of schedules of tariff on manufactured articles, and that the law fixing those schedules may be safely modified sufficiently to afford a consideration for making such trade agreements with foreign nations without any injury to the just rights of the industries of this country which are entitled to protection; and

Whereas that fair protection which the law should afford, but which unhappily it does not afford, to the live-stock and farming interests of this country should, and must be, in the main, that class of protection which prevents the closing of the markets of the world to the products of the farm and the ranch; and

Whereas the live-stock producing interests of this country are co-extensive with its farming interests, and the prosperity of the live-stock and farming interests of the country is the basis of the prosperity of the nation and entitled to as much consideration on the part of the Government as any other interests in this country, which they have not received; and

Whereas the live-stock and farming interests of this country demand equal opportunities, fair treatment, and a "square deal": Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That we request on the part of the Congress of the United States the enactment of such laws as will enable the Government of the United States to enter into trade arrangements or agreements with such foreign nations as will afford the best possible market for the live stock and its products, as well as other farm products, of this country, and to that end that it empower the President of the United States, as a consideration for such agreements, to grant, give, and make such concessions and modifications in the tariff schedules on articles of commerce as will enable this Government to secure the most favorable trade relations with foreign countries in live stock and the products of live stock, as well as other farm products, of this country, while preserving the just rights of every interest involved; and, further, be it

Resolved, That, expressing our entire confidence in our President, Theodore Roosevelt, we respectfully urge him to present to Congress in his next annual message the just and reasonable demands and needs of the live-stock products and farming interests of this country, to the end that there may be fairly laid before Congress our demands for a fair opportunity to seek the markets of the world with our products; and, further, be it

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the house be directed to send a copy of these resolutions to the President of the United States, and a further copy be furnished to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President of the Senate of the United States, besides sending same to each of our Texas Congressmen and Senators.

THOS. B. LOVE,
Speaker of the House.
A. H. DAVIDSON,
President of the Senate.

I hereby certify that house concurrent resolution No. 7 was adopted by the house of representatives of the thirtieth legislature of the State of Texas on February 1, 1907, and this is a correct copy of same.

BOB BARKET,
Chief Clerk of the House.

I hereby certify that house concurrent resolution No. 7 was adopted by the senate of the thirtieth legislature of the State of Texas on February 7, 1907, and this is a correct copy of same.

CLYDE D. SMITH,
Secretary of the Senate.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. BERRY, from the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8446) to extend the time for the completion of a bridge across the Missouri River at Yankton, S. Dak., by the Yankton, Norfolk and Southern Railway Company, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 526) granting an increase of pension to Robert Cole;

A bill (H. R. 500) granting an increase of pension to Wilson M. Holmes;
 A bill (H. R. 561) granting an increase of pension to Giles Townsend;
 A bill (H. R. 654) granting an increase of pension to Amos J. Loranger;
 A bill (H. R. 1171) granting an increase of pension to Alfred Nichols;
 A bill (H. R. 1223) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Jarvis;
 A bill (H. R. 1232) granting an increase of pension to John V. Buskirk;
 A bill (H. R. 1242) granting an increase of pension to Luke Reynolds;
 A bill (H. R. 1377) granting an increase of pension to Thomas G. Dallman;
 A bill (H. R. 1474) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Fisher;
 A bill (H. R. 1574) granting an increase of pension to Franklin Sampson;
 A bill (H. R. 1665) granting an increase of pension to Frederick E. Hayward;
 A bill (H. R. 1728) granting an increase of pension to George C. Vance;
 A bill (H. R. 1767) granting an increase of pension to James H. Marcum;
 A bill (H. R. 1838) granting an increase of pension to Asa J. Clothier;
 A bill (H. R. 1851) granting an increase of pension to Ralph D. Parsons;
 A bill (H. R. 1890) granting an increase of pension to Adam Leak;
 A bill (H. R. 2064) granting an increase of pension to Daniel Sullivan;
 A bill (H. R. 2270) granting an increase of pension to John Lehn;
 A bill (H. R. 2324) granting a pension to Christina Vetter;
 A bill (H. R. 2821) granting an increase of pension to Turner J. Preble;
 A bill (H. R. 2905) granting an increase of pension to Burr Clark;
 A bill (H. R. 3239) granting an increase of pension to George W. Stewart;
 A bill (H. R. 3785) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Wagner; and
 A bill (H. R. 4150) granting an increase of pension to John C. McGinis.
 Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 23860) granting an increase of pension to William G. Cummings, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.
 Mr. SCOTT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:
 A bill (H. R. 8775) granting an increase of pension to Carrie Diefenbach;
 A bill (H. R. 4553) granting an increase of pension to William R. Wilkins;
 A bill (H. R. 4757) granting an increase of pension to Edward Willis;
 A bill (H. R. 5029) granting an increase of pension to Beverly W. Sullivan;
 A bill (H. R. 5050) granting an increase of pension to Ephraim M. Boltz;
 A bill (H. R. 5162) granting an increase of pension to James F. Travis;
 A bill (H. R. 5202) granting an increase of pension to Jennie R. Hunt;
 A bill (H. R. 5388) granting an increase of pension to Silas Garrison;
 A bill (H. R. 5497) granting a pension to Cora Allie Booth;
 A bill (H. R. 5627) granting an increase of pension to John C. L. Hargis;
 A bill (H. R. 5634) granting an increase of pension to John Redding;
 A bill (H. R. 5774) granting a pension to Cornelia Mitchell;
 A bill (H. R. 5800) granting an increase of pension to Joseph G. Maddocks;
 A bill (H. R. 5926) granting a pension to Sarah C. Pitman;
 A bill (H. R. 6206) granting an increase of pension to Stephen J. Henning;
 A bill (H. R. 6237) granting an increase of pension to David Behthorum;
 A bill (H. R. 6353) granting an increase of pension to John Shobert;

A bill (H. R. 6767) granting an increase of pension to Hobart P. Sweet;
 A bill (H. R. 7242) granting an increase of pension to Marcus Davis;
 A bill (H. R. 7255) granting a pension to Christopher Horn;
 A bill (H. R. 7374) granting an increase of pension to Elijah C. Adolotte;
 A bill (H. R. 7554) granting an increase of pension to Andrew Cramer;
 A bill (H. R. 7565) granting an increase of pension to Orville Dickinson;
 A bill (H. R. 7578) granting an increase of pension to Levi Hoskins;
 A bill (H. R. 7634) granting an increase of pension to Martha G. Matlack;
 A bill (H. R. 8408) granting an increase of pension to Richard Prost;
 A bill (H. R. 8503) granting an increase of pension to David C. May;
 A bill (H. R. 8682) granting an increase of pension to James P. Bledsoe;
 A bill (H. R. 8770) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Burgess;
 A bill (H. R. 8785) granting an increase of pension to John Finch;
 A bill (H. R. 9256) granting an increase of pension to Martha E. Sanford;
 A bill (H. R. 9445) granting a pension to Ida E. G. Pierce;
 A bill (H. R. 9448) granting an increase of pension to Thomas B. Hockley;
 A bill (H. R. 9664) granting an increase of pension to Edwin C. Durfee; and
 A bill (H. R. 9785) granting an increase of pension to William A. Lyon.
 Mr. BURNHAM, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:
 A bill (H. R. 9850) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Williams;
 A bill (H. R. 10023) granting a pension to Martha J. Lewis;
 A bill (H. R. 10164) granting a pension to Emma L. Beatty;
 A bill (H. R. 10212) granting an increase of pension to Charles M. Arnold;
 A bill (H. R. 10241) granting an increase of pension to Joseph M. Parish;
 A bill (H. R. 10301) granting an increase of pension to George N. Beymer;
 A bill (H. R. 10430) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Ledgerwood;
 A bill (H. R. 10431) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Kenisston;
 A bill (H. R. 10739) granting an increase of pension to N. Delmont McReynolds;
 A bill (H. R. 10889) granting an increase of pension to William H. Garrison;
 A bill (H. R. 10935) granting an increase of pension to Annie L. Boone;
 A bill (H. R. 11198) granting an increase of pension to Emanuel Sandusky;
 A bill (H. R. 11285) granting an increase of pension to William Kirkpatrick;
 A bill (H. R. 11621) granting an increase of pension to Hollis Smith;
 A bill (H. R. 11845) granting an increase of pension to William J. Clark;
 A bill (H. R. 11848) granting an increase of pension to George E. York;
 A bill (H. R. 11995) granting an increase of pension to Wesley Layton;
 A bill (H. R. 12240) granting an increase of pension to Albert J. Ackerly;
 A bill (H. R. 12344) granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Sproul;
 A bill (H. R. 12346) granting an increase of pension to Abraham D. Stouffer;
 A bill (H. R. 12349) granting an increase of pension to Edgar M. Barber;
 A bill (H. R. 12353) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Little;
 A bill (H. R. 12563) granting an increase of pension to Andrew L. Hook;
 A bill (H. R. 12580) granting an increase of pension to Charles E. Youtt;
 A bill (H. R. 12631) granting an increase of pension to James E. Leslie;

A bill (H. R. 12969) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Buck; and

A bill (H. R. 13012) granting an increase of pension to Charles L. Cole.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 17011) granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Brown, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

He also, from the same committee, to whom were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment, and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (H. R. 13133) granting an increase of pension to Gilbert W. Clark;

A bill (H. R. 13163) granting a pension to Rittie Blackwell;

A bill (H. R. 13334) granting an increase of pension to Erasmus A. Doe;

A bill (H. R. 13810) granting an increase of pension to Abraham J. Simmons;

A bill (H. R. 13816) granting an increase of pension to Thomas McPeck;

A bill (H. R. 13963) granting an increase of pension to William H. Turner;

A bill (H. R. 14104) granting an increase of pension to Milton Brown;

A bill (H. R. 14228) granting an increase of pension to Abram Nussbaum;

A bill (H. R. 14244) granting an increase of pension to Edwin R. Phillips;

A bill (H. R. 14779) granting an increase of pension to Willard Wheeler;

A bill (H. R. 15241) granting an increase of pension to Samuel De Haven;

A bill (H. R. 15452) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Stanfield;

A bill (H. R. 15492) granting a pension to William L. Tyler;

A bill (H. R. 15543) granting an increase of pension to George W. Maynard;

A bill (H. R. 15688) granting an increase of pension to Esther C. Kelly;

A bill (H. R. 15879) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Salat;

A bill (H. R. 16192) granting an increase of pension to Charles Reed;

A bill (H. R. 16221) granting an increase of pension to Job Clark;

A bill (H. R. 16261) granting an increase of pension to John P. Bare;

A bill (H. R. 16343) granting an increase of pension to Francis D. Matheny;

A bill (H. R. 16439) granting an increase of pension to Patrick Bogan;

A bill (H. R. 16607) granting an increase of pension to Mary Denny;

A bill (H. R. 16608) granting an increase of pension to Catharine McNamee;

A bill (H. R. 16687) granting an increase of pension to Jefferson G. Turner;

A bill (H. R. 16718) granting an increase of pension to James Milmore;

A bill (H. R. 16819) granting a pension to John V. Sumner;

A bill (H. R. 16834) granting an increase of pension to Allan S. Rose;

A bill (H. R. 16839) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Johnson;

A bill (H. R. 16905) granting a pension to Anna E. Marble;

A bill (H. R. 16925) granting a pension to Johanne Lange;

A bill (H. R. 16939) granting an increase of pension to Patterson Reese;

A bill (H. R. 17002) granting an increase of pension to Levi Deater; and

A bill (H. R. 17091) granting an increase of pension to George Myers.

Mr. BLACKBURN, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 24046) to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America, reported it without amendment.

Mr. HEMENWAY subsequently said: Mr. President, I was temporarily absent from the Chamber this morning when the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BLACKBURN] reported the bill (H. R. 24046) to incorporate the Hungarian Reformed Federation of America. I desire to ask unanimous consent for its consideration at this time.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, let the bill go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Under objection, the bill will go to the Calendar.

Mr. PETTUS, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 24887) providing for a United States judge for the northern judicial district of Alabama, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. CULBERSON, from the the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8427) to annul certain titles to land acquired by judicial proceedings in the courts of the United States in Texas, and for other purposes, reported it without amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. DICK, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7726) to correct the naval record of Charles C. Lee, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. KEAN, from the Committee on Territories, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 23720) to aid the Council City and Solomon River Railroad Company, reported it without amendment.

Mr. ANKENY, from the Committee on Irrigation, to whom the subject was referred, reported an amendment proposing to amend the act approved June 17, 1902, entitled "An act appropriating the receipts from the sale and disposal of public lands in certain States and Territories to the construction of irrigation works for the reclamation of arid lands," intended to be proposed to the agricultural appropriation bill, submitted a report thereon, and moved that it lie on the table, and be printed; which was agreed to.

Mr. FORAKER, from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8119) to readjust the boundaries of the naval reservations in Porto Rico established in pursuance of the act of July 1, 1902, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

Mr. FULTON, from the Committee on Claims, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8420) for the relief of the Mille Lac band of Chippewa Indians in the State of Minnesota, and for other purposes, asked to be discharged from its further consideration, and that it be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs; which was agreed to.

PRINTING AND DISTRIBUTION OF DOCUMENTS.

Mr. PLATT. I submit a supplemental report from the Joint Printing Investigation Commission of the two Houses, and ask that it be printed in the Record.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. In the absence of objection, the report will be printed in the Record.

The report is as follows:

The Printing Investigation Commission respectfully supplements its preliminary report, dated March 26, 1906, by submitting herewith the draft of an act to amend the act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents, approved January 12, 1895, and certain amendments thereto.

Much of the proposed act is necessarily a reenactment of existing law. Those phases of the proposed act which are in the nature of new legislation are designed to clarify inconsistencies and to dispose of what the Commission feels to be forced constructions of existing statutes, such forced constructions being justified only upon the ground of public necessity.

REPRINTING OF BILLS.

For instance, under existing law no provision exists for the reprinting, in a number exceeding 300 copies, of any pending bill or resolution, no matter how great its importance or how great the public interest attaching to such pending legislation. Under existing law the number of copies of bills originally printed is limited to less than 1 copy for each Member and Delegate and 2 copies for each Senator. No provision of law exists for the reprinting of any public bill in a number exceeding 300 copies, and then only by action of the Joint Committee on Printing. It has been the practice, under what seems to the Commission to be a forced construction of section 99 of the act of January 12, 1895, for the Public Printer to reprint to any number required any public bill, on requisition of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives. This forced construction of the law has been in operation through many Congresses. Manifestly, there should exist provision of law whereby the supply of bills and resolutions in the document rooms of the Senate and House of Representatives may be replenished, and that upon requisition of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House, who have jurisdiction over those offices and who are equipped to estimate properly the needs of such offices and who are charged with much larger responsibilities in other matters. But, in the judgment of the Commission, such authority for reprinting should be within judicious limitations which would obviate the practice now existent which is susceptible of the greatest possible abuse. To deny, as the law at present denies, to these officers the authority to anticipate the needs of the Senate and the House, will either result in many embarrassing delays, or, on the other hand, in just such forced construction of the law and possible abuses.

The fact that both the Senate and the House have not been seriously embarrassed in hundreds of instances is due alone to the fact that the law has been utterly disregarded.

Recently the Commission and the Public Printer, conferring on this subject, agreed that it was not wise to continue longer a policy which could not be justified by any reasonable construction of the statutes. Since that time the Joint Committee on Printing has been called upon to approve almost innumerable reprints of public bills, such reprints in one instance numbering at least fifteen, necessitating increased expense in putting to press at so frequent intervals and an unnecessary consumption of the time of the joint committee on matters of the most trivial character and not exceeding in cost in many instances \$1.

REPRINTING OF LAWS.

There is no provision for the reprinting of a public law, except by action of the Senate or the House. Such authority does not even

reside in the Joint Committee on Printing or the Committee on Printing of either House. The reprinting of a public law is of frequent necessity, and in most instances the laws being reprinted the cost of such reprinting is most inconsequential. A recent proposition for reprinting a public law consisting of but one page involved extensive debate on the floor of one of the Houses of Congress, and the cost of the reprinting desired was not in excess of \$7. The Commission ventures the belief that the consumption of one minute's time of either House is of infinitely greater pecuniary consequence than the cost of the reprinting desired.

REPRINTING OF COMMITTEE REPORTS.

The same condition obtains as to the reprinting of committee reports. The necessity for such reprinting occasionally arises. The Commission does not believe that in ordinary cases even the time of the Committee on Printing of either House, much less the time of the joint committee, and still less the time of the Senate or the House, should be consumed by such trifles. At present such reprints may be legally obtained only through the action of the Senate or the House, the committees being powerless to relieve the situation. Under past practices it has happened that the time of the Senate and the House has not been needlessly consumed with the consideration of these trivial propositions, but under present conditions, with the existing law being properly construed and strictly applied, the Committees on Printing will be compelled to ask both Houses for consideration of many of these cases, which manifestly are inconsequential. In most cases these reports are likewise mere leaflets.

Under the forced construction of existing statutes above referred to it has been the practice of the Public Printer to honor requisitions of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House for reprints of bills, public laws, committee reports, and even miscellaneous documents, but manifestly the Public Printer under the same authority would be as fully justified in reprinting 1,000,000 copies of the Yearbook of the Department of Agriculture or the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD as he would be in reprinting a leaflet law or committee report or any document. It is in recognition of the practical necessity of providing a reasonably elastic method of securing such reprinting, yet with a desire to obviate the possibility of abuse, that the Commission has proposed the following amendment to the law:

"The Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House of Representatives may order the reprinting, in a number not exceeding 1,000 copies, of any pending bill or resolution or any public law not exceeding fifty pages, or any report from any committee or Congressional commission, on pending legislation, not accompanied by testimony or exhibits or other appendices and not exceeding fifty pages, when the supply shall have been exhausted. The Public Printer shall require each requisition for reprinting to cite the specific authority of law for its execution."

The items of printing committed to the discretion of the Secretary of the Senate and the Clerk of the House will not exceed in any one instance a maximum cost of \$20, while the average cost would not be in excess of \$3.

PRINTING OF EXTRA COPIES.

A condition practically parallel to that above cited, yet broader in scope, exists in respect of the printing of additional copies, now ordered by the Senate and the House within the \$500 limit, established by existing law. The law provides that extra copies of documents and reports within the limit of \$500 may only be secured by simple resolution of either House. It is believed by the Commission that the necessity of action by the Senate and the House in ordering the printing of extra copies within a reasonable limit can be very safely entrusted to the Joint Committee on Printing, thus relieving both Houses of a labor which occasionally becomes burdensome, owing to the inspiration of prolonged debate and the consumption of valuable time. The chief advantage which the Commission seeks to secure is in the avoidance of delays.

Frequently propositions coming within this class, after having been most carefully digested by the Committees on Printing, become subjects of extended inquiry on the floor entirely disproportionate to the pecuniary importance of the items involved, which in many instances do not exceed \$25 in cost.

In many instances the Committees on Printing have been censured on account of delays in securing the printing of documents and reports which were needed by the Senate and the House, such delays being unavoidable by reason of the reluctance of either House to consider them, or the existence of obstructive parliamentary situations. Usually the class of printing coming within this rule is of a nature requiring prompt attention and could better and with equal safety be met by the Joint Committee on Printing, and at the same time the necessity for putting documents and reports back to press would frequently be avoided.

The Commission proposes as a statute covering the aforesaid conditions the following, the proviso alone being new legislation:

"Orders for printing extra copies, otherwise than herein provided for, shall be by simple, concurrent, or joint resolution. Either House may print extra copies to the amount of \$500 by simple resolution; if the cost exceeds that sum, the printing shall be ordered by concurrent resolution, except when the resolution is self-appropriating, when it shall be by joint resolution. Such resolutions, when presented to either House, shall be referred immediately to the Committee on Printing, who, in making their report, shall give the probable cost of the proposed printing upon the estimate of the Public Printer; and no extra copies shall be printed before such committee has reported: *Provided*, That the printing of additional copies may be performed upon orders of the Joint Committee on Printing within a limit of \$200 in cost in any one instance."

AUTHORITY TO PRINT COMMITTEE HEARINGS.

The present law provides for the printing of hearings of committees to the number of fifty copies, which may be enlarged upon the approval of the Committee on Printing of each House to such a number of copies as can be printed within the \$500 limit, and provides, further, that there shall not be printed for the use of any committee "any hearing or other document costing in excess of \$500." The intent of the law in respect of the limitations of committee printing is evidently to place the number of copies authorized to be printed at fifty and the limitation as to cost at \$500, yet the Commission is aware that both these limitations are frequently and necessarily disregarded. The Commission is in possession of data showing numerous instances where necessary printing for committees has been largely in excess of the limitations imposed by law. In one instance, that of the Senate Committee on Interstate Commerce in the railroad-rate hearings, comprising a set of five volumes, the printing involved an original expense of \$7,910, whereas the law clearly places the limitation at \$500. The Commis-

sion, recognizing the paramount importance of and large public interest in the proceedings of that committee, is not disposed to criticize either the committee in question or the Public Printer, since Congress was not in session and since the practice followed by the Public Printer was an inheritance from his predecessors.

The original print of the hearings on the Government Hospital for the Insane cost \$4,776, and even the hearings of the Committees on Appropriations frequently exceed the limitations now imposed by law.

The Commission is prepared to admit that much of this costly printing for committees is absolutely necessary, yet, as has been suggested heretofore, the law, in affording committees reasonable latitude in the printing of their hearings, should likewise guard against the possibility of great abuses through the printing of large editions, recognizing that there is at all times authority in Congress for printing such hearings up to any number which Congress may deem necessary. It has therefore placed a limitation upon the number of copies of hearings for the use of committees, making it sufficiently large to meet all reasonable requirements, while placing an absolute limit which committees themselves shall not exceed.

While the Commission is not disposed to criticize the past disregard of law as to the cost of printing within the number authorized, it can not so readily excuse the disregard of the limitations as to the number of copies supplied for committee distribution. In certain instances hearings have been printed for committees to the number of several thousand copies, in one instance reaching the number of 10,000.

The proposal of the Commission on this phase of its suggested legislation is as follows:

"No committee of Congress shall be empowered to procure the printing of more than 200 copies of any hearing or other document for its use, except upon the approval of the Committee on Printing of either House of Congress, and then in a number not exceeding 500 copies."

COMMITTEE HEARINGS TO BE PRINTED AS NUMBERED DOCUMENTS.

No provision of law exists at the present time for the preservation of committee hearings in the form of public documents, and much valuable information, which, indeed, is the foundation upon which all important legislation of Congress is based, is ultimately lost to the world. The importance of preserving these hearings has been suggested not only by the Librarian of Congress, but by the librarians of many of the principal libraries of the country, and the Commission has no doubt that an inquiry addressed to librarians generally would reveal a practically unanimous demand for the preservation of matter of such vital importance.

Quite outside the demands which presumably reach the librarians of the country for such hearings, it is apparent that Congress can not afford to permit matter so vital to itself to be lost.

Whereas many librarians suggest that certain documents now received could be properly eliminated from the depository lists without public loss, there seems to be a unanimity of opinion among librarians as to the value of committee hearings, which they are now enabled to obtain only by chance.

The Commission, in its proposed enactment, takes cognizance of those hearings which are of a strictly confidential character and makes provision for their protection.

The Commission recognizes that in the printing of the "usual number" of committee hearings it may not be important to supply the document rooms of the Senate and the House, but under the present regulations of the Joint Committee on Printing these offices would be supplied only to the extent of the demands made upon them; in other words, there exists to-day a provision of law whereby such printing can be kept at a figure absolutely minimal.

The proposed legislation providing for the printing of committee hearings as public documents is as follows:

"All committee hearings, or hearings of Congressional commissions, not accompanying reports, shall be printed as numbered documents, except when held in confidence by order of the committee or commission, in which case it shall be the duty of the chairman thereof to notify the Public Printer, in writing, of such action when the order to print is given."

PRINTING IN DOCUMENT FORM OF DEPARTMENT REPORTS, ETC.

Another abuse sought to be corrected, the magnitude of which can only be appreciated by extensive research, resides in the present practice of both Houses of Congress, under existing law, of ordering printing in document form of matter transmitted to it by Departments, bureaus, commissions, and boards, and miscellaneous reports referred to committees, which, under the operation of standing rules of both Houses, are ordered printed as a matter of form concurrently with their reference to appropriate committees. Under this practice occasionally printing of enormous magnitude but of doubtful importance occurs, involving an alarming encroachment upon the allotment of the appropriation for printing and binding for Congress.

While it is manifest that the right of either House to order original printing for its use should not be obstructed, yet it is equally certain that neither House should blindly order printing without full knowledge of the consequences of its action. As an illustration of the abuse likely to occur under present practices, the case may be cited of a report transmitted to Congress upon request of the Senate comprising purely statistical matter, important in itself, but worthless for circulation, and presenting little more than an exhibit of book-keeping. The cost of printing this matter as a document, under the formal order of the Senate to print, would have amounted to nearly \$60,000. Had not a resolution for the printing of extra copies been introduced, which resolution was referred to the Committee on Printing in each House, and which brought to said committees their first knowledge of the original proposal to print, the abuse would never have come to light. The original order was made under the automatic rule of the Senate, without reference to a committee having jurisdiction over its printing. The attention of the Committees on Printing having thus been drawn to the original order to print, resulting in a necessary estimate as to the cost thereof, led to the abandonment of the further printing of the document, but not until a practically unnecessary expense of \$25,000 had been incurred under the aforesaid automatic action of the Senate rule.

It is conceivable that expensive printing of this character may occasionally be very necessary, but it is inconceivable that an automatic rule of either House should be permitted to so operate as to plunge Congress into wholesale expenditure without explicit knowledge of its scope.

Any amendment of the law calculated to reach this abuse must necessarily take cognizance of those multitudinous instances where formal orders to print must necessarily issue with comparatively little regard for cost, since the cost is trivial. The Commission in its proposed amendment of the law makes provision not only for the pro-

tection of Congress in the matter of extravagance, but safeguards both Houses against the inconvenience which would follow an arbitrary rule applicable in all cases. It would manifestly be not burdensome to any committee of Congress or to any Executive Department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government transmitting reports to Congress, either in response to inquiries or in submission of original reports of great volume, to accompany them with an estimate of the cost of printing, that Congress, in issuing its order to print, should act in the light of such information rather than in total ignorance thereof, as at present.

In the general investigation of the problems of the public printing and binding, accusations of extravagance against Congress itself were freely made by those familiar with the general subject. The Commission is free to admit that much of this criticism is well founded, and that the efforts of the Commission to reform extravagances in the Departments can be more consistently, if not more successfully, prosecuted when Congress shall have first applied remedial measures to its own operations.

Hence, it is proposed that there shall be adopted a provision of law in the following language:

"Either House may order the printing of a document not already provided for by existing law, but only when the same shall be accompanied by an estimate from the Public Printer as to the probable cost thereof. Any Executive Department, bureau, board, or independent office of the Government submitting reports of documents in response to inquiries from Congress shall submit therewith an estimate of the probable cost of printing to the usual number. Nothing in this paragraph shall apply to reports or documents not exceeding fifty pages."

COST OF PRINTING CERTAIN REPORTS TO BE CHARGED TO CONGRESSIONAL ALLOTMENT FOR PRINTING.

The Commission, in its investigation, found that one of the chief sources of extravagance lay in the fact that the original cost of departmental printing had been chargeable to the Congressional allotment, instead of the departmental allotments, the Congressional allotment serving as a general fund to which all Departments had free access. To cure the extravagances growing out of this system, the Commission recommended to Congress at its last session, and Congress enacted a provision of law, whereby the original cost of the composition, stereotyping, etc., on all Department publications became chargeable to the allotment of the Department or office from which such publication emanated. The Commission recognized, at the time of the enactment of this provision of law, that the application of this principle would, in sporadic instances, invite a measure of opposition on the score of possible inequalities, but an examination of the practical application of this new principle reveals fewer instances of such inequalities than the Commission had reason to anticipate, and none which can not readily be adjusted.

Mindful of the practice which led to large drafts upon the Congressional allotment in the printing of matter emanating from Executive Departments and properly chargeable to their own appropriations, the closing of which door to extravagance was accomplished in the enactment of public resolution No. 13 of the last session of Congress, the Commission would view with the gravest apprehension any proposition to reopen the door to the large Congressional appropriation for printing and binding, and placing this appropriation again, in any degree, at the mercy of those who heretofore encroached upon it.

But the Commission is disposed to recognize the necessity for some equitable provision for the printing of boards and societies of quasi-public character, which, under their charters, are required to report to Congress, but to whom no appropriation or allotments of appropriations for printing are made.

The Commission therefore proposes to meet this necessity by the enactment of the following provision:

"The cost of printing of any document or report hereafter printed by order of Congress which can not under the provisions of public resolution No. 13, Fifty-Ninth Congress, first session, approved March 30, 1906, be properly charged to any other appropriation, or allotment of appropriation, already made, shall, upon order of the Joint Committee on Printing, be charged to the allotment of appropriation for printing and binding for Congress."

NUMBERING OF CONGRESSIONAL DOCUMENTS AND REPORTS.

One of the complaints reaching the Commission from librarians and others having custody and frequent use of public documents, Congressional and departmental publications, has been on the score of duplication of and vagueness in titles. Since the opening of the Fifteenth Congress, in 1817, all documents and reports printed by order of Congress have been numbered in series, presumably for convenience of identification. The question of consecutive numbering seems to have overshadowed both the importance of either title or classification, and that which may have been in the early stages of our history a convenience has become not only an inconvenience, but grotesquely confusing.

It is conceivable that the present system was applicable to conditions existing at the time of its adoption, when but 647 documents and reports were printed during the entire term of a Congress, but when applied to present conditions, which involve the issuance of from 10,000 to 12,000 publications during the term of one Congress, the number in the Fifty-eighth Congress having been 11,189, with prospects of greater increase as the operations of the Government are amplified, it is apparent that some alteration of practice should follow.

Under prevailing practices a multiplication of designations, necessitating the employment of six different terms to describe a document without even then disclosing its title, has resulted, as in the case of "Fifty-first Congress, second session, vol. 16 of House Executive Document," which is "part 2 of vol. 5 of part 5 of No. 1 of part 2 of vol. 16."

To exclude from the numbered series all but strictly Congressional documents would obviate the confusion above noted, working no hardship upon anyone, depriving no Senator or Member of any part of his quota, but meeting the enthusiastic approval of every librarian charged with the custody of public documents.

The remedy contemplated by the Commission would further enable the superintendent of documents to supply to designated depository departmental publications while the same were of current interest, instead of withholding such publications until they can receive their document number in the Congressional series. By reason of the delay in supplying the depositories due to the present practice, these depositories secure, through Department officials or through Senators and Representatives, copies of the departmental editions of current publications. In due course of time, but in many instances after such documents and reports are no longer current, these depositories are supplied with duplicate copies of the same publications under the

regular depository distribution. The original copy is then returned to the superintendent of documents, who must find some other outlet of distribution for a document out of date; and, as a result, hundreds of tons of such documents returned from various depositories are lying in the warehouses of the Government, with no one willing to receive them. The expense of the unnecessary mail transportation alone is an item of which Congress may well take cognizance.

But more important than all other considerations, from the standpoint of expense, is the unnecessary cost of putting every departmental publication, including all the annual and the more important bureau reports, to press for a second time. It should be understood that before these publications are transmitted to Congress they are printed as departmental publications, and printed copies rather than manuscript copies constitute the report officially transmitted. These publications are then reprinted in the Congressional numbered series. The proposal of the Commission cures this glaring evil.

The remedial provision proposed by the Commission contemplates the exclusion from the numbered Congressional series of all departmental publications and provides for their designation by title. It will also afford to the superintendent of documents, whose duty it is to compile these publications for purposes of binding and distribution, authority to classify them by subjects instead of as now, arbitrarily, by consecutive numbers, such numbers and arrangement being governed only by the date of their transmittal to Congress.

The arrangement suggested in the proposed legislation has been presented to the Librarian of Congress, as well as to many of the other important libraries of the country, and, without exception, it has met with their approval. In fact, the criticism of the present method and the suggestion of the proposed reform emanated from the librarians, and the importance of its adoption has been frequently urged by the American Library Association. The Commission has yet to hear of a single objection urged by any librarian or public official charged with the custody or frequent use of Government publications to this proposed plan, and it has been freely and widely discussed.

The provision in question is embodied in the following language:

"Publications ordered printed by Congress, or either House thereof, shall be in four series, namely, one series of reports made by committees of the Senate, to be known as Senate reports; one series of reports made by the committees of the House of Representatives, to be known as House reports; one series of documents, other than reports of committees, the orders for printing which originate in the Senate, to be known as Senate documents, and one series of documents other than committee reports, the orders for printing which originate in the House of Representatives, to be known as House documents. The publications in each series shall be consecutively numbered in the order in which they are received, the numbers of each series continuing in unbroken sequence throughout the entire term of a Congress; but these provisions shall not apply to documents printed in confidence for the use of the Senate in executive session, or to confidential hearings of committees. If the publication so ordered be an annual report, or any other publication originating in or prepared by an Executive Department, bureau, office, commission, or board, it shall not be numbered in the document or report series of either House of Congress, but shall be designated by title as hereinafter provided. Of all Department reports required by law to be printed the usual number shall be printed concurrently with the departmental edition.

"In the binding of Congressional numbered documents and reports every publication of sufficient size on any one subject shall hereafter be bound separately, and receive the title suggested by the subject of the volume; and the others shall be arranged in convenient volumes and bound in a manner as directed by the Joint Committee on Printing."

OFFICE OF SUPERINTENDENT OF DOCUMENTS.

The Commission is impressed with the inequity of charging against the expense of the public printing and binding the cost of administration of the office of superintendent of documents, which is distinctively a cataloging and publishing office and in no sense a printing office.

It has been frequently charged that the cost of production in the Government Printing Office exceeds that which obtains in commercial printing establishments. It would be just as equitable to charge to the expense of printing and binding the administration of the publication offices of the various Executive Departments as to charge against the departmental allotments for printing and binding the administration of the office of the superintendent of documents, which is now actually done. The expense of the public printing and binding can much more justly be computed by the elimination of so irrelevant an item as that to which allusion has been made.

The proposed enactment to remedy this condition is embodied in the following language:

"That after June 30, 1907, no part of the expense of the administration of the office of superintendent of documents shall be charged to any appropriation or allotment of appropriation for the public printing and binding, but shall be otherwise specifically appropriated for; and the administration of said office of superintendent of documents shall be under the direction of the Public Printer, as heretofore."

DESIGNATED DEPOSITORIES AND LAND-GRANT COLLEGES.

The Commission invites attention to an anomalous condition in respect of the depository distribution. The law to-day provides for the delivery to the superintendent of documents of 501 copies of each public document, for distribution to designated depositories, and State and Territorial libraries, while the actual number of such depositories may be considerably in excess of this number and is actually to-day 539. That certain Members of Congress have not availed themselves of their right to designate depositories has afforded the only relief from what would otherwise have been a very embarrassing condition.

The number of such depositories may be increased in future years as the redistricting of States may occur under laws of reapportionment. The Commission deems it most desirable that some automatic provision of law may be provided whereby the number of documents available for depository distribution may be placed upon a parity with the number of depositories designated. Added to its provision for the correction of this evil, the Commission has deemed it desirable to include among designated depositories the land-grant colleges. This list of educational institutions number sixty-five, embracing many of the leading colleges and universities of the country, including such institutions as the Alabama Polytechnic Institute, the University of California, the University of Illinois, Purdue University of Indiana, the Iowa State College of Agriculture and Mechanic Arts, the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, the Ohio State University, Cornell University, the Virginia Agricultural and Mechanical College and Polytechnic Institute, the Hampton Normal and Agricultural Institute, and

many others, the combined membership of whose faculties number 2,672, or an average faculty of forty-one.

The total cost involved in the proposed increase in the number of depositories would not exceed \$30,000, but from this sum should be deducted the cost of the volumes supplied to these institutions through personal requests on Departments, Senators, and Members of Congress, which, the Commission has reason to believe, includes fully 50 per cent of the depository publications.

The amendment to the present law to cover this phase of the Commission's investigations is in the following language:

"That upon request of the superintendent of documents the Public Printer is hereby authorized and directed to either increase or diminish the number of copies of publications furnished for distribution to designated depositories, or State and Territorial libraries, so that the number of copies delivered shall be equal to the number of libraries on the list: *Provided*, That the number thus delivered shall at no time exceed the number authorized under existing statutes: *And provided further*, That the allotment of 501 copies furnished for distribution to libraries be increased or reduced, from time to time, as the redistributing of States or the rearrangement of depository lists under provisions of law shall demand, to such numbers as may be necessary to comply with the law: *And provided further*, That all land-grant colleges shall be constituted as depositories for public documents, subject to the provisions and limitations of the depository law."

LAPSE OF AUTHORITY TO PRINT WITHIN TWO YEARS.

The final provision suggested in the measure which accompanies this report, while apparently trivial in its character, is nevertheless important and essential to the proper application and administration of the provisions of public resolution No. 14 of the last session of Congress, authorizing the printing of Government publications in editions, as the public needs may require, instead of to an arbitrary number, regardless of the demand therefor. The amendment in question provides that where the whole number of copies of any document shall not have been ordered within one year from the date of the original order the authority to print shall lapse, except upon the approval of the Joint Committee on Printing.

It is apparent that in most instances the demand for the average document not of commanding public interest will have ceased at the expiration of a year's time, and essentially the account should be closed. It is recognized that there may be, and probably will be, exceptions to this rule, which are safeguarded by the vesting of authority in a competent committee to order subsequent editions, within the original limitations, where a legitimate demand is known to exist.

The legislation proposed for the proper application of public resolution No. 14, above referred to, is in the following language:

"In the printing of any document or report or any publication authorized by law to be printed, or hereafter authorized to be printed, the whole number of copies of which shall not have been ordered within two years from the date of the original order, the authority to print shall lapse, except as orders for subsequent editions may be approved by the Joint Committee on Printing, and then in no instance shall the whole number exceed the number originally authorized by law."

It may be stated in this connection that under the operation of public resolution No. 14 aforesaid, the printing of fully 1,000,000 volumes within the current year has been saved in the Congressional distribution alone, regardless of important economies in the Departments, while under the former practice these publications would have been printed to an arbitrary number and the unused quotas and portions of quotas would have added to the accumulations already stored in Government warehouses and would in time have become obsolete and worthless.

The appropriations for the public printing and binding had grown from \$3,774,498.33, in the fiscal year 1896, to \$6,963,255.82, in the fiscal year 1906. Under this rapid growth the appropriation for the current fiscal year would have been in the neighborhood of \$7,500,000, instead of which it was considerably under \$6,000,000, including specific appropriations, and the needs of the Government in this respect will have been amply supplied.

This showing is the result of some intelligent legislation, which, while vigorously effective, has been devoid of hardship or embarrassment to Congress or any Department of the Government. It can be safely asserted, on the contrary, that the public printing and binding to-day is being performed under conditions of greater facility and acceptability than ever before in the history of the Government. The Commission, as a result of its investigations and deliberations, is convinced that this enormous saving, in the face of a constantly increasing volume of matter requiring to be printed and a continuous amplification of governmental operations inevitably resulting from the growth and expansion of the country's industries, can be largely supplemented after further research by those competent to make such research, in the way of simplification of methods, reforms in distribution, avoidance of costly duplications, and cooperation on the part of those officials of the Government charged with the responsibility of publication.

T. C. PLATT,
WM. PINKNEY WHYTE,
C. B. LANDIS,
J. B. PERKINS,
J. M. GRIGGS.

Mr. PLATT. I also introduce a bill relative to the same subject, and ask that it be referred to the Committee on Printing.

The bill (S. 8510) to amend an act providing for the public printing and binding and the distribution of public documents was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Printing.

INDIAN TRIBAL FUNDS.

Mr. CLAPP. I am directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was recommitted the bill (H. R. 5290) providing for the allotment and distribution of Indian tribal funds, to report it favorably with amendments, and I submit a report thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The first amendment was, in line 3, after the word "the," to

strike out "President" and insert "Secretary of the Interior;" in line 4, after the word "authorized," to strike out "in his discretion" and insert "and directed;" in line 6, after the word "deem," to strike out "to be sufficiently advanced in civilization;" in line 8, after the word "her," to strike out "own;" in line 12, before the word "amount," to strike out "said" and insert "the;" in the same line, after the word "amount," to insert "so apportioned and allotted;" on page 2, line 2, after the word "shall," to strike out "be paid to" and insert "thereupon be subject to the order of;" in line 3, after the word "Indian," to strike out "at such times and in such manner as the President may direct;" and in line 6, after the word "therefor," to strike out:

And before any portion thereof is paid, such Indian shall file a release of any further interest in the tribal or trust funds of such tribe or tribes of which he may be a member, such release to cover any funds that may hereafter be deposited to the credit of such tribe or tribes.

So as to make the section read:

That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized and directed, from time to time, to designate any individual Indian belonging to any tribe or tribes whom he may deem to be capable of managing his or her affairs, and he may cause to be apportioned and allotted to any such Indian his or her pro rata share of any tribal or trust funds on deposit in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the tribe or tribes of which said Indian is a member and the amount so apportioned and allotted shall be placed to the credit of such Indian upon the books of the Treasury, and the same shall thereupon be subject to the order of such Indian: *Provided*, That no apportionment or allotment shall be made to any Indian until such Indian has first made an application therefor.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 2, to strike out section 2, in the following words:

SEC. 2. That the President shall, by Executive order, prescribe rules and regulations to carry out the purposes of this act. Such regulations may also provide the method and proceedings for the distribution of the share of any allottee who may die before payment and after such allotment on the books of the Treasury Department.

And in lieu thereof to insert:

SEC. 2. That the Secretary of the Interior is hereby authorized to pay any Indian who is blind, crippled, decrepit, or helpless from old age, disease, or accident, his or her share of the tribal trust funds in the United States Treasury belonging to the tribe of which such Indian is a member, and of any other money which may hereafter be placed in the Treasury for the credit of such tribe and susceptible of division among its members, under such rules, regulations, and conditions as he may prescribe: *Provided*, That this authority shall not apply to any fund against which the United States has advanced money to be reimbursed from such fund, until such reimbursement has been made.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended.

Mr. CLAPP. The amendment on page 1, line 4, inserting the words "and directed" should not be concurred in.

The amendment was nonconcurrent in.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on concurring in the remaining amendments made as in Committee of the Whole. The amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time, and passed.

PEARL RIVER BRIDGE, MISSISSIPPI.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 25363) to authorize the New Orleans and Great Northern Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi, to report it favorably without amendment.

Mr. McLAURIN. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill just reported by the Senator from Arkansas.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER BRIDGE AT LOUISIANA, MO.

Mr. BERRY. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 25046) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Louisiana, Mo., to report it favorably without amendment.

Mr. STONE. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOSÉ MARCH DUPLAT.

Mr. WARREN. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report a joint resolution and ask for its present consideration.

The joint resolution (S. R. 92) to authorize the Secretary of War to permit José March Duplat to receive instruction at the Military Academy at West Point was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized to permit José March Duplat, of Venezuela, to receive instruction at the Military Academy at West Point: Provided, That no expense shall be caused to the United States thereby, and that the said Duplat shall agree to comply fully with all regulations for the police and discipline of the United States Military Academy; that he shall be studious, and that he shall give his utmost efforts to accomplish the courses in the various departments of instruction: And provided further, That in the case of the said Duplat the provisions of sections 1320 and 1321 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall be suspended.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the joint resolution?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

THE NATIONAL GERMAN-AMERICAN ALLIANCE.

Mr. DILLINGHAM. I am directed by the Committee on the Judiciary, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 11273) to incorporate The National German-American Alliance, to report it favorably without amendment.

Mr. KNOX. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. HALE. Let the bill go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection being made, the bill will be placed on the Calendar.

MISSISSIPPI RIVER DAM NEAR SAUK RAPIDS, MINN.

Mr. NELSON. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8400) to amend an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Sauk Rapids, Benton County, Minn.," approved February 26, 1904, to report it back with an amendment, and I submit a report thereon. This is a short local bill, and I ask for its present consideration. It will take but a moment.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The amendment was, on page 1, line 9, before the word "years," to strike out "four" and insert "three;" and after the word "years" to insert "and six months;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 3 of an act entitled "An act permitting the building of a dam across the Mississippi River at or near the village of Sauk Rapids, Benton County, Minn.," approved February 26, 1904, be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read as follows:

"Sec. 3. That this act shall be null and void unless the dam herein authorized be commenced within three years and six months and be completed within six years from the time of the passage of this act."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

W. W. PEIRCE.

Mr. DICK. I am directed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 17875) waiving the age limit for admission to the Pay Corps of the United States Navy in the case of W. W. Peirce, to report it favorably without amendment, and I submit a report thereon. I invite the attention of the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] to the bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill just reported by the Senator from Ohio.

The Secretary read the bill; and there being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HALE. I am directed by the Committee on Naval Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 24925) making appropriation for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, and for other purposes, to report it with amendments and to submit a report thereon. I give notice, Mr. President, that I shall ask the Senate to take up the bill to-morrow morning after the routine morning business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The bill will be placed upon the Calendar.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Mr. TALIAFERRO introduced a bill (S. 8511) granting a pension to George L. Dancy; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also introduced a bill (S. 8512) for the relief of James J. Abbott; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. CLAY introduced a bill (S. 8513) granting an increase of pension to Fannie Jones; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. WARREN introduced a bill (S. 8514) to provide for raising a Volunteer Army of the United States in time of actual or threatened war; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CURTIS introduced a bill (S. 8515) extending the existing pension laws to the Kansas Militia and other persons who rendered valiant service under regular United States officers in line of action during the war of the rebellion from 1861 to 1865; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

Mr. CLAPP (by request) introduced a bill (S. 8516) to refer to the Court of Claims the claims of persons of mixed Choctaw or Chickasaw Indian and negro blood, arising under the treaty of September 27, 1830; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. SCOTT introduced a bill (S. 8517) for relief of the council of St. Peter's Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Shepherdstown, W. Va.; which was read twice by its title, and, with the accompanying paper, referred to the Committee on Claims.

Mr. FULTON (for Mr. CRANE) introduced a bill (S. 8518) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Interior to sell to Percival Lowell certain land situate in the county of Coconino, Territory of Arizona, and within the limits of the San Francisco Mountains Forest Reserve; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. CULLOM introduced a bill (S. 8519) for the relief of the Chicago, Peoria and St. Louis Railway Company of Illinois; which was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Finance.

AMENDMENTS TO APPROPRIATION BILLS.

Mr. HANSBROUGH submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$10,000 for a preliminary geological examination of the lignite areas of North Dakota, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the sundry civil appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. DEPEW submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$2,500 to be paid to Mrs. Sidonia Thieriot, widow of Jacob H. Thieriot, late United States consul to Lisbon, being the equivalent of one year's fees as consul at Lisbon, intended to be proposed by him to the general deficiency appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FULTON (for Mr. CRANE) submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate \$1,250,000 for the transmission of mail by pneumatic tubes or other similar devices, etc., intended to be proposed by Mr. CRANE to the post-office appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FLINT submitted an amendment relative to the Mare Island Navy-Yard, Cal., etc., intended to be proposed by him to the naval appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

Mr. FRYE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the river and harbor appropriation bill; which was referred to the Committee on Commerce, and ordered to be printed.

SENATOR FROM UTAH.

Mr. HOPKINS submitted the following amendment intended to be proposed by him to Senate resolution No. 142, relative to the right of REED SMOOT to a seat in the Senate; which was ordered to lie on the table and be printed.

After the word "Resolved," in line 1, insert the following: "two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein."

PRODUCTION OF INDIA RUBBER IN THE PHILIPPINES.

Mr. CARMACK (for Mr. MORGAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Bureau of Insular Affairs, through its Chief, is directed to inform the Senate as to the rubber-producing capacity of the several islands of the Philippine Archipelago that belong to the United States. And that he give an approximate area of rubber-producing lands in said several islands that belong to the Government of

the United States, and of the different descriptions of rubber-bearing trees, vines, and bulbs from which india rubber is derivable, and the general bearing productiveness of such islands as commodities of commercial value. And that in aid of this investigation the government of the territory of the Philippines is requested to give its attentive consideration and assistance.

INDIA-RUBBER CONCESSIONS IN THE KONGO FREE STATE.

Mr. CARMACK. For the Senator from Alabama [Mr. Morgan] I submit a resolution, and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is requested, if it is not incompatible with the public service, to inform the Senate whether the Government has information as to any concession from King Leopold of Belgium, as sovereign of the Kongo Free State, to any company or syndicate of citizens of the United States for the gathering of india rubber within the area of the territory of the Free State of the Kongo, located at the mouth or along the banks of the Kassai River, from its junction with the Kongo River southerly into the rubber forests or areas of that part of the Free State of the Kongo.

And that he inform the Senate of the names of American citizens to whom such concession has been made, and as to the territorial boundaries thereof, and as to the terms thereof, and as to the rights, privileges, and powers given by such concession to such company or syndicate. And also as to what powers are given by such concession to such company or syndicate to exercise government or control over the native people of such area, either separately or in cooperation with the government exercised by King Leopold over the Free State of the Kongo. And that the President inform the Senate whether the company or syndicate, as above referred to, has submitted its concession to the Government of the United States for approval or disapproval, and whether the same has been approved.

And also that the President is requested to inform the Senate whether the Government has any information as to the exclusive concession of a right to gather rubber in the forests of Liberia has been made by the Liberian Government to a British company or syndicate, and the terms and conditions of such concession, and to what extent the same has been or is being executed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. HALE. I have no objection to the resolution being referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. CARMACK. I had asked for its present consideration. Does the Senator object?

Mr. HALE. Let it be referred.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made to the present consideration of the resolution, and it will be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

SAMANA BAY COMPANY.

Mr. DEPEW submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Resolved, That the President of the United States is hereby requested to enter into correspondence with the Government of the Dominican Republic with the view to impressing upon that Government the justness of submitting to a court of arbitration the claim of the Samana Bay Company against said Government.

WILLIAM O. BEALL.

Mr. PATTERSON submitted the following resolution; which was considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, directed to transmit to the Senate all complaints against the official conduct of William O. Beall, formerly secretary to the Commission to the Five Civilized Tribes, and made the subject of investigation during the months of November and December, 1906, by William Dudley Foulke, special inspector, together with all evidence taken before or secured by the said inspector, his report thereon, and any and all records in the custody of the Department relative thereto.

DISTRICT HEALTH DEPARTMENT.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I offer the resolution which I send to the desk, for which I ask present consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The resolution submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire shall be read.

The Secretary read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia are hereby directed to forthwith transmit to the Senate the names of all employees in the health department of the District, their several duties and titles, if any, and the amount of compensation in each case.

By unanimous consent, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I desire to make a brief observation concerning the resolution I have offered, and will ask the Secretary to read an editorial from the Washington Post of this morning.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

AN OPEN DOOR TO DANGER.

The remarks of Health Officer Woodward regarding the necessity for giving increased authority to milk inspectors and providing for more complete inspection of outside dairies are deserving the earnest attention of Congress. Although the District has been fairly well cared for this year in other respects, the health department of Washington has been treated in niggardly fashion by Congress. The officials are underpaid, and their number is inadequate to perform the work as it should be done. The dairies furnishing milk to the people of the District are not properly inspected. Some of them are not inspected at all. Tubercu-

culous cows have been discovered in dairies supplying the District with milk, and in other dairies the disregard of sanitary precautions is appalling.

The health department is unable to enforce its own regulations in respect to contagious diseases. School children are not properly protected, and parents are not warned of the presence of contagious diseases in the schools. Milkmen are not promptly notified of the existence of contagious diseases among their patrons, with the result that no precautions whatever are taken to prevent the spread of disease by the circulation of bottles. The markets of Washington, although they are much cleaner than those of many other cities, are admitted to be deserving of closer inspection.

It is impossible for the health officer and his assistants to exercise the vigilance necessary to protect the people of Washington on the small allowance made by Congress. The door is open to danger, and only good fortune seems to prevent serious consequences. The good health of Washington, in other words, continues in spite of the mockery of organized protection and not because of its ministrations.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, that is rather a remarkable pronouncement from a leading paper of the city of Washington, and I would not make a single observation concerning it were it not for the fact that similar matter has found its way into the columns of newspapers in other sections of the country.

The fact is that, as a member of the Committee on the District of Columbia, I have been laboring for sixteen long years in promoting legislation covering medical and sanitary matters in this District; and I venture to say that there is not a city in the American Union that has on its statute books as many laws relating to these subjects as has the District of Columbia, and in view of that fact, it is rather astonishing to me that the health officer of this District feels it his duty to rush into print and say to the people of this District, to the Congress of the United States, and to the people of the country that we have neglected matters of health in the city of Washington. A few days ago the distinguished Chemist of the Agricultural Department, Doctor Wiley, felt it his duty to take a shy at the committees of Congress in regard to this matter, saying that we were neglecting legislation in reference to the public health. From various quarters has come the same cry, that adequate support is not being given to that important department of the District government, and that, as a result, we are having impure milk; that our school children are being neglected, so far as their health is concerned, and that all sorts of calamity is threatening the people of this District because of our disregard of the rights of the people.

Why, Mr. President, regarding the school children, we have physicians whose duty it is to examine them every day to ascertain whether or not they are in good health, or whether they show any indication of contagious disease, and we have legislated over and over again regarding contagious diseases at the instance of the health officer. I do not know what more we can do in that direction than we have done; and yet this editorial says that we are leaving the school children to the mercy of contagious diseases without doing anything to remedy the evil.

Now, Mr. President, I have submitted this resolution for the purpose of ascertaining precisely how many officials are employed by the health department of the District of Columbia, what their salaries are, inasmuch as this editorial says they are underpaid, and what their various duties are, so that we may be able intelligently to take up this matter, and if the health department needs more assistance, I feel sure that the committees of Congress will be glad to give it; but I want to add that I think in our legislation heretofore we have been reasonably liberal in that regard.

I trust the resolution may be passed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

SCHOOL LAND AT ST. AUGUSTINE, FLA.

Mr. NELSON submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment, in the form of a substitute, of the House to the bill (S. 1726) entitled "An act making provision for conveying in fee the piece or strip of ground in Saint Augustine, Florida, known as 'The Lines,' for school purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House and agree to the same with amendments as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "Matanzas," insert the words "or San Sebastian."

Page 1, line 5, strike out the words "Chief of Engineers" and insert in place thereof the words "Secretary of War."

Page 1, line 9, strike out the word "city."

Page 1, line 9, after the word "instruction," insert the following words: "of Saint Johns County, Florida."

That the title of said act read as follows:

"An act making provision for conveying in fee the piece or strip of ground in Saint Augustine, Florida, known as 'The Lines,' for school purposes to the board of public instruction of Saint Johns County, Florida."

And the Senate agree to the same.

KNUTE NELSON,
A. J. McLAURIN,
FRED T. DUBOIS,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

H. O. YOUNG,
ADIN B. CAPRON,
JAMES L. SLAYDEN,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 21944. An act relating to the entry and disposition of certain lands in the State of Nebraska, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Public Lands.

H. R. 23391. An act to change the time of holding the United States district and circuit courts in the eastern district of North Carolina and to provide for the appointment of a clerk of the courts at Washington, N. C.; was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 25234. An act permitting the building of a dam across Rock River at Lyndon, Ill.; was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

H. R. 25472. An act to fix the limitation applicable in certain cases, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. PROCTOR. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed consideration of the bill (H. R. 24815) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

Mr. McENERY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. PROCTOR. I will yield to the Senator from Louisiana for the consideration of a bill, which he assures me will lead to no discussion.

ESTATE OF HENRY WARE.

Mr. McENERY. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (S. 1217) for the relief of the estate of Henry Ware, deceased.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Claims with an amendment, to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to the legal representative of the estate of Henry Ware, deceased, the sum of \$18,732; said sum to be in full payment for all injury and damage that was done to said decedent and his property due to the seizure, detention, and partial spoliation of 758 bales of cotton, the property of said decedent, and for \$15,700 which said decedent was compelled to pay to said officials of the United States in order to get possession of part of said property. And there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$18,732.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GEORGE M. ESTERLY.

Mr. BURNHAM. I ask the Senator from Vermont to yield to me in order that I may secure the passage of a short bill, which will not lead to debate.

Mr. PROCTOR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. BURNHAM. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration at this time of the bill (H. R. 18924) for the relief of George M. Esterly.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of the Treasury to pay to George M. Esterly, of Valdez, Alaska, \$3,000, in payment for the loss of the gasoline launch *Marilla*, owned by him and accidentally burned in the district of Prince William, Territory of Alaska, on July 18, 1905, while in official use and under the rental of the United States Geological Survey, the appropriation having been recommended by the Secretary of the Interior and by the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, the recommendations and the facts concerning the loss being fully

set forth in House Document No. 732, Fifty-ninth Congress, first session.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION LAND.

Mr. GAMBLE. I request the Senator from Vermont to yield to me that I may ask for the consideration of a bill which has come from the House of Representatives.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do.

Mr. GAMBLE. I ask that House bill 24987, which came from the House to-day, be laid before the Senate, and I ask unanimous consent for its immediate consideration.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 24987) to authorize the sale and disposition of a portion of the surplus or unallotted lands in the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in the State of South Dakota, and making appropriation and provision to carry the same into effect; which was read the first time by its title, and the second time at length, and by unanimous consent, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration.

Mr. GAMBLE. I send up two amendments to the bill.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Dakota proposes an amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 14, strike out the word "three" and insert "five" in lieu thereof; so that it will read:

Draw interest at 5 per cent per annum for ten years.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The second amendment proposed by the Senator from South Dakota will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 6, after the word "act," in line 24, it is proposed to insert:

And there is hereby appropriated the further sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the purpose of making the allotments provided for herein.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. KEAN. Mr. President, has this bill been reported by a committee?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. It is a House bill which the Chair laid before the Senate at the request of the Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. KEAN. Has it been before a Senate committee?

Mr. GAMBLE. A bill with substantially the same provisions was reported from the Committee on Indian Affairs to the Senate on the 13th of December. The only proposition there was that instead of a valuation or price fixed the lands should be appraised. A report was not filed for the reason that an inspector was out negotiating a treaty. The inspector succeeded in negotiating a treaty, and on the 14th of February the ratification of the treaty was authorized by bill from the Committee on Indian Affairs in the Senate. This bill provides substantially the form of the agreement, and the two amendments which I have offered make this bill conform to the agreement.

Mr. KEAN. I do not think the practice is a good one. Therefore I must object.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Objection is made.

Mr. GAMBLE. I trust no objection will be interposed. It is a matter of great importance to the people of my State.

Mr. KEAN. Let the bill go to the committee. I have no objection to the bill, but the practice is not a good one.

Mr. GAMBLE. I will be very glad to make myself plain to the Senator from New Jersey. This matter has been considered twice by the Committee on Indian Affairs and has been favorably reported. The bill that was read here this morning and which has passed the House is in the identical language of the agreement. It is in conformity to the agreement with the Sioux tribe of Indians and with the statute, and it is a matter of great importance. The lands to be opened embrace about a million acres lying immediately west of the Rosebud Reservation, which was opened three years ago. If it is referred to the committee, the danger will be that it can not be considered at this session.

Mr. LODGE. Will the Senator from South Dakota allow me to make a suggestion?

Mr. GAMBLE. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. If there is a similar bill on the Calendar covering the same subject-matter, it is open to the Senator to substitute this bill for the Senate bill.

Mr. KEAN. That is correct.

Mr. LODGE. He can take it up by unanimous consent tomorrow.

Mr. GAMBLE. I am very anxious to have the matter dis-

posed of. It is one of great importance to the people of my State.

Mr. LODGE. I was pointing out to the Senator how he can pass it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. ALDRICH. If the matter is of such supreme importance to anybody as the Senator from South Dakota suggests, it is very easy to refer the bill to the Committee on Indian Affairs and have it reported back at once. Otherwise we will establish a precedent which would be an extremely dangerous one, especially if it is an important bill. I think it ought to go to the committee and be reported back in the usual way.

Mr. GAMBLE. I do not want to be unduly persistent in the matter. Possibly I do not make myself plain.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will suggest that the debate is proceeding by unanimous consent. Is there objection to the explanation to be made by the Senator from South Dakota?

Mr. ALDRICH. I do not object to the explanation, but I shall insist that the bill go to the committee and be considered in the usual way.

Mr. GAMBLE. In reply to that, I want to say that this measure has been considered fully by the Committee on Indian Affairs of the Senate. The bill that is reported by the Senate Committee on Indian Affairs is in the same language as this bill. This is a House bill. It passed the House Saturday. I called it up in this form so that there might be expedition in its passage. If it goes to the committee, the danger is there will not be opportunity to have it considered and will deny to it the privilege of passing at this session.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from South Dakota yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. GAMBLE. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. I understood the Senator to say that a bill identical with this was before the Committee on Indian Affairs in the Senate, and had been reported by the Senate committee and is now on the Calendar.

Mr. GAMBLE. It is not on the Calendar.

Mr. CLAY. Then this bill could not be substituted for it. That is true.

Mr. GAMBLE. The report was authorized last Thursday.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. If there is objection, the bill will be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Mr. ALDRICH. I thought I made my position plain about it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair so understood.

Mr. ALDRICH. It is not necessary to reiterate it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair was about to state that the bill will be referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

DAVID HARRINGTON.

Mr. BULKELEY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont is entitled to the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. PROCTOR. I yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BULKELEY. I am directed by the Committee on Military Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 14361) granting an honorable discharge to David Harrington, to report it favorably without amendment; and I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill. It directs the Secretary of War to grant an honorable discharge to David Harrington, late a member of Company D, Thirty-second Ohio Volunteer Infantry.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

TOWN SITES IN OKLAHOMA.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do.

Mr. CULBERSON. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 24989) to provide for the computation for town-site purposes of homestead entries in certain portions of Oklahoma.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CHATTahoochee RIVER BRIDGE.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. PROCTOR. I yield to the Senator from Georgia.

Mr. CLAY. I ask for the immediate consideration of the bill (H. R. 24821) to authorize the Georgia Southwestern and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River between the States of Alabama and Georgia.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CONDEMNATION OF LAND FOR STREETS.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PROCTOR. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire, and then I must insist on proceeding with the agricultural appropriation bill.

Mr. GALLINGER. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 23384) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a Code of Law for the District of Columbia,' regulating proceedings for condemnation of land for streets."

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (H. R. 24815) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, when this bill was last under discussion we had reached the Forestry Service, at the bottom of page 36, and the amendment increasing the salary of the Forester was under consideration. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] made some objection, and authorized me to make a statement, but as he is present he will make it much better himself.

I wish to say, while I am up, that if I said anything that seemed to detract from a proper appreciation of the services of the several Assistant Secretaries, I did not intend anything of the kind. They are hard-working, underpaid men. We have increased the salaries of the heads of Departments 50 per cent; we have increased our own 50 per cent; and I certainly think the assistant secretaries deserve an increase as much as anyone that I know of. I shall at the proper time move that the salary of the Assistant Secretary of the Department of Agriculture be made \$5,000.

The reason why it was not proposed by the committee as an amendment was not because we did not favor it, for it was discussed and the general expression was in favor of it, but because we did not wish to ask for too much; and as the appointments have usually been semi-political, and the term of service not very long, we thought they might perhaps bear a manifest injustice a little more easily than men whose services were continued for years and whose services would be required for years.

I wish myself that we might have in each Department an assistant, a nonpolitical appointment, who should serve continuously and be entirely familiar with the administration of the Department. It would be of great assistance to the new head of the Department, and those changes occur very frequently.

So far as concerns a general increase of the salaries of these officers at the present session, it is not too late, I think, to make it now, and I shall certainly propose it in regard to the Assistant Secretary of this Department. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President, I find on looking at the salaries which are paid to the heads of bureaus in the Agriculture Department and in some other Departments, notably, the Department of Commerce and Labor, that pretty nearly all of the salaries have already been raised, and that the head of this Bureau, the Chief Forester, seems to have been about the most modest and retiring of all of them. All save only him have succeeded in getting their pay put up, and I do not think we ought to discriminate against a modest man. He is getting no more to-day than the officer got in this place ten years ago, and I learn that he has not in any way solicited the increase; that he has not even asked for it. Under these conditions I do not think any further objection could be made to the amendment.

Mr. FULTON. Before the amendment is voted on, I ask the Senator from Vermont to yield to me for a few minutes.

Mr. PROCTOR. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, when this amendment was up for consideration on Thursday last I took occasion to suggest that if the proposed increase in salary was to be predicated

on the alleged exceptionally efficient organization and administration of this Bureau, I should have to oppose the amendment. I am not concerned whether this salary shall be increased or diminished, and I do not apprehend that the gentleman who occupies the office is very much concerned whether his salary shall be increased or not. It is quite well known—indeed, it has been stated on this floor—that he is a gentleman of very large wealth, and I have seen it frequently stated in the press, and I have never heard it denied—

Mr. PROCTOR. It is a mistake.

Mr. FULTON. What is that?

Mr. PROCTOR. I think that is a mistake.

Mr. FULTON. What; that he is a gentleman of large wealth?

Mr. PROCTOR. Yes, sir.

Mr. FULTON. I have frequently seen it stated in the press, and I have never heard it denied, that he does not appropriate any of the salary to his own use, but to charitable purposes, for which he is indeed to be commended.

I would not now further detain the Senate by a discussion of this subject were it not for the fact that immediately on my making the statement mentioned, my friend, the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. BEVERIDGE], took the floor in defense of the character of the Forester, Mr. Pinchot. I was surprised that my remarks should have been interpreted as in any wise reflecting on his character, integrity, or devotion to duty. I had no such thought or purpose. I esteem Mr. Pinchot most highly; believe him to be a gentleman of high character and patriotic purpose. I do not, however, at all times, in all respects and particulars approve of his theories as applied in connection with the administration of the forest reserves. How far he is responsible for all the abuses growing out of the administration of these reserves I do not know, nor shall I undertake to say. I do not believe, in fact, that he is in any degree responsible therefor, but since this question has arisen I do wish to say that, in my judgment, not only is the administration of that department unbusinesslike, but the policy itself has been, by the constant and ceaseless aggressions of the Bureau, carried far beyond the original purpose and intention of Congress in providing for forest reserves. In all the statutes authorizing the creation of these reserves it has been expressly stipulated that they should not include lands chiefly valuable for agriculture or mining purposes. And yet there are to-day withdrawn for reservations, and included therein, hundreds of thousands of acres of lands in the State of Oregon that are chiefly valuable for grazing and agriculture; land on which not a stick of timber ever has grown or ever will grow. The lands within these reservations are being leased to stock men and the rental kept as a distinct fund under the absolute control of the Bureau. The last statement I saw there was something like half a million dollars in this fund.

I have not seen the statement for this year. All this money is being levied and collected without any authority of law. It is not paid into the Treasury subject to appropriation, and when it is proposed to provide by legislation for covering it into the Treasury the movement is met by the most strenuous opposition on the part of this Bureau. So much of this fund is expended by the Bureau officials as they deem necessary for such purposes as they deem proper and the balance is carried to the credit of the Bureau. The Senator from Indiana says that no Department has actually earned so much money for the Government. Of that and of the policy of converting the public lands into a permanent governmental revenue-producing proposition I shall have something to say further on. But before taking that up let me remind the Senator that through no Department has the Government lost or been actually defrauded of so much as through the administration of the forest reserves.

We have heard much of public-land frauds, and it was generally assumed that it was under the timber and stone act that these frauds were chiefly perpetrated. As a matter of fact, the Government has never lost a dollar under the administration of that act. For every acre of land for which a patent was issued under that act the Government received the price fixed by statute, namely, \$2.50. The frauds under that act did not consist in cheating the Government out of the price, but in the party applying to purchase taking a false oath, testifying that he was purchasing for his own use and benefit, when, in fact, he had, in many instances, already contracted to sell to another. But the Government was paid the full price.

Under the forest-reserve statutes the boundaries of reservations have been made to include millions of acres of worthless, or comparatively worthless, lands owned by land-grant railroad companies. These lands the companies were permitted to exchange for the finest timber lands in the world. In the Rainier Forest Reserve, in the State of Washington, hundreds of thousands of acres of rocks and crags and beetling cliffs were thus

exchanged, but the valuable timber lands within the reserves were retained, of course, by the company. In my own State the Northern Pacific Railway Company was permitted to exchange these worthless lands, these rocks and towering peaks, and probably the eternal snows of Rainier's lofty summit, for entire townships of unsurveyed lands on which stand the grandest forests of the world. Much of this land was unsurveyed, and hence settlers or other entrymen could not take it, but under the Department's construction the "forest-reserve scrip," so called, was applicable to it. And so by the administration of the forest reserves this Government has lost millions of dollars, and the subsidies to certain land-grant railroads have been enhanced many millions more, for the lands they located were the finest and actually worth twenty or thirty dollars per acre at the time and now doubtless worth \$100 per acre, while the lands they surrendered will be worth no more on the morning of the millennium than they are to-day. It is true that Congress has repealed the law that permitted these exchanges, but that for which I condemn the Bureau is for having permitted these worthless lands to be included in reserves, knowing, as they must have known, what the result would be.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. FULTON. Certainly.

Mr. FLINT. I simply want to ask the Senator from Oregon whether it was not the act itself that caused the trouble, in that the Congress of the United States permitted this selection to be made, as he states. The Administration was in no way responsible for the selection.

Mr. FULTON. Not altogether.

Mr. CARTER. Will the Senator permit me to make a remark at this point?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FULTON. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. I state here and now that the original lieu land exchange scheme which was provided for in the appropriation bill contemplated only the relief of actual settlers whose claims were embraced within forest reserves. Had that law been confined, as Congress intended it to be confined, to individuals no substantial injury would have occurred. Originally the Interior Department held that the law did not extend to land-grant corporations. The General Land Office held to that view. The Secretary of the Interior arbitrarily, I understand, commanded the General Land Office to reverse its decision and permit this wholesale exchange by the land-grant railroad companies of their worthless lands in forest reserves, and thus this mighty rush for lieu lands occurred, to the great and enduring detriment of the people of the United States.

Mr. FULTON. The Senator from Montana is eminently correct. As a matter of fact, answering the question of the Senator from California [Mr. FLINT], which was whether the law is not to blame for the frauds that grew up under the administration of the forestry department, I answer no.

In the first place, as the Senator from Montana has said, the proper construction of the law creating the forest reserves clearly entitles no person except the settler to exchange his land for land on the outside. That is the plain spirit of the law. It is what Congress contemplated at the time, and it was only by the construction of the Department that a different feature was incorporated into the law.

But that is not the only reason why I say this Department must be chargeable for the fraud that grew up under the administration of that law. As I have said before, it was for the Department to say when and where withdrawals for forest reserves should be made. It was for them to determine whether a tract should be withdrawn that embraced a large portion of the holdings of a land-grant railroad or not; and when they knew the construction that was being given to the law, when they knew that by withdrawing for a forest reserve millions of acres of land held by the land-grant railroads, a great portion of which was practically worthless, the owners of those lands could exchange them for the best agricultural and timber lands in the country, I say it was the duty of a faithful administrator of the law to decline to withdraw those lands and to incorporate them into a reserve.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FULTON. With pleasure.

Mr. CARTER. The point made by the Senator was distinctly made by Mr. Secretary Bliss. He felt that the law should not avail land-grant railroad companies, and in creating a reservation in the Territory of Arizona he specified as forest reserve

only the even-numbered sections, to the end that the railroad company could not by any possibility avail itself of the privilege of exchanging that chaparral country for the white pine and yellow pine of Puget Sound.

The present Secretary, however, departed from the policy of Mr. Bliss in that behalf. He deliberately included the even sections and made a contract with the railroad company extending their time for the selection of these timbered lands after the law itself had been repealed.

Mr. FULTON. I am under obligations to the Senator from Montana for that contribution to the subject.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. FULTON. Certainly.

Mr. PERKINS. I should like to ask my friend from Oregon how this reflects upon the Chief Forester or the Forestry Service? Does not the administration of it properly belong, under the Secretary of the Interior, to the General Land Office? While frauds have been committed undoubtedly in levying this lieu-land scrip, should not the blame, if there is blame, properly rest upon the Land Department of the Government?

Mr. CARTER. Will the Senator from Oregon permit me to make a suggestion at that point?

Mr. FULTON. With pleasure.

Mr. CARTER. The Secretary of the Interior upon any day upon recommendation to the President might have withdrawn this Imperial forest from entry by lieu-land scrip. He had the same command over the public domain that is exercised to-day, and yet, with a pliancy hitherto unknown in a Department of the Government, he witnessed the confiscation by the railroad land grant companies of the most superb areas of the globe.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FULTON. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. In reference to what the Senator from Montana has so well said, it is unnecessary to take that up as having reference to the head of the Forestry Department, because all that was done under the Interior Department proper before it was transferred to the Agricultural Department and before it was in charge of the Forester, whose case is now before us.

Mr. FULTON. When was the present Forester appointed?

Mr. WARREN. He has no control.

Mr. FULTON. He was appointed long before the transfer to the Agricultural Department, and right here—

Mr. WARREN. One moment. He was the Forester in the Agricultural Department, and he had little to do with the forest reserves under the Interior Department.

Mr. FULTON. I am not saying that he had.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. FULTON. In a minute. I wish to make myself clear on this proposition, and then I will yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Certainly; I will not interrupt the Senator.

Mr. FULTON. I will then yield with pleasure to the Senator from Indiana.

The questions and statements of Senators continually imply exactly what I sought clearly to negative when I commenced, that I am making some criticism of or assault upon the present Forester. I thought I made myself clear on that point. I do not say that he is responsible for this condition, but I do say that the Forestry Department, as a bureau charged especially with this branch of the service, must bear some of the responsibility with the Interior Department.

Now I yield with pleasure to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I do not feel like interrupting the Senator.

Mr. FULTON. If I was discourteous to the Senator I did not mean to be so.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. All I was going to ask him was to direct his attention to the question of the Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS], which seems to me, with my very limited knowledge of this subject, to be extremely pertinent to the particular point which we were discussing the other day, to wit, the services and their value, with the excellence of character and every other admirable quality of the Chief Forester.

Mr. FULTON. You can not pass any eulogy on Mr. Pinchot personally to which I will not agree.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. His efficiency—

Mr. FULTON. You can not say a word as to his urbanity or gentlemanliness and all that sort of thing to which I will not subscribe.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; I have made no statement about his urbanity or gentlemanliness, which seems to amuse one Sena-

tor; my remarks were directed to his efficiency as a public servant. As to the question which the Senator is discussing with vigor and feeling, the Senator from California pointed out, it seemed to me, that that was a criticism properly directed to the Interior Department for any defect, with which this perfectly admirable public servant (the Chief Forester) had nothing to do and with which he was not chargeable.

Mr. FULTON. Very well. I am perfectly willing—in fact, I am desirous—that this responsibility shall be placed on the shoulders to which it properly belongs. I myself believe, and I say here right now, that the real responsibility did rest upon and the consequences must be borne by the Secretary of the Interior. But incidentally this Bureau shares a certain amount of responsibility. I am simply taking advantage of this particular occasion to give expression to some of the views I have on this subject in a general way.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I have become more enlightened as the Senator proceeds. I was at luncheon when the Senator began.

Mr. FULTON. I very much appreciate the Senator's compliment.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. If that is the purpose of the Senator, and if that is the scope of his remarks, I will listen to him with increased pleasure.

Mr. FULTON. The Senator from Indiana told us the other day that this Bureau, this great Department, as he called it—for a great Department, he said, it has come to be—was contributing more money to the Treasury than any other Department of the Government. Whether that is an exactly accurate statement I do not know. I do not know that the Senator intended it for an absolutely accurate one. I suppose he intended simply to draw attention to the amount that they are actually contributing to the Government.

Be that as it may, the question arises, Mr. President—and I think it is a pertinent one—how are they raising this money? How are they creating this great fund? That is the particular question that I desire to discuss here to-day in a brief way. They are creating this fund by withdrawing from public sale and from entry under the homestead laws or under any of the laws of Congress great bodies of valuable land, valuable for timber, valuable for agriculture, valuable for grazing—taking them and converting them into great reserves within the body of a State and rendering it impossible for them to contribute in any degree or to any extent whatever to the industrial life, growth, and commercial development of the State. They are robbing the State of its resources, hampering it in its development, and for what purpose? To create a great fund for this Government. I deny, Mr. President, that it is good policy. I deny that it is a wise policy, to convert the public land of this country for all time into a revenue-producing proposition for the benefit of the General Government. I deny that it is a wise public policy that the Government shall engage in business within the limits of a State.

I submit, Mr. President, that when a new State is created there is an implied promise, if not a direct one, that the public lands shall not be retained by the General Government longer than is necessary to dispose of them in an orderly and beneficial way. I believe it is the implied contract between the General Government and the States that the States shall have the benefit of these lands being carried into their industrial life and contributing to their revenues and industries.

The State of Oregon has something like 20,000,000 acres of merchantable timber, about one-third of its entire area. There are to-day incorporated within the forest reserves in that State something like 14,000,000 acres, or approximately one-fourth of the entire area of the State.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon will kindly suspend. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. Senate resolution No. 214, that a duly qualified entryman is entitled to patent for land, etc.

Mr. CARTER. I ask unanimous consent that the unfinished business be temporarily laid aside.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Oregon will proceed.

Mr. FULTON. A large portion of the 14,000,000 acres of which I speak that is incorporated within forest reserves is capable of being devoted to agriculture, is fine grazing land, is of great value, and would be of great value to the people of that State, and would contribute largely toward building up the industries of that State. By what right does the General Government exclude from the industries of the State that great portion of her public domain?

Mr. PERKINS. I dislike to interrupt my friend, but we have the same object in view—

Mr. FULTON. If the Senator dislikes to interrupt me, it is offset by the pleasure I enjoy in being interrupted by him.

Mr. PERKINS. If errors exist, we want to correct them. Is it not a matter of fact, I ask my friend from Oregon, that the lands within these reservations are open to homestead entry and open to preemption, and is it not a fact that within the past year 2,000 applications have been filed, and did it not appear before our committee that one-half of those applications for homesteads were filed for the purpose of obtaining the timber upon the land?

Mr. FULTON. How many of the applications were granted?

Mr. PERKINS. About one-half of them.

Mr. FULTON. Were one-half granted in all the public-land States? How many were granted in all the public-land States?

Mr. PERKINS. I am not able to state correctly, but it is my impression that 2,000 applications were made, according to the statement before our committee, and that about one-half of them were granted.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GALLINGER in the chair). Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. CARTER. It is well known, I think, that for several years past all of the timber and stone lands in the States of Oregon and Washington have been under suspension. The record is that all of the entries have been very carefully scrutinized, and since 1900 only seventy-two entries out of the two thousand and odd have been found fraudulent and subject to criticism because of error in the papers or in the attempt to execute the contract with the Government.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. FULTON. Certainly.

Mr. FLINT. I desire to call the attention of the Senator from Montana to the fact that, as shown by the President's message to Congress February 13, after the investigation within the past few months of the desert-land entries, the homestead entries, and other entries in the West, over 50 per cent of them have been found to be either irregular or based upon fraud.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. FULTON. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President, I do not challenge the President's message. I do challenge the fact.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, a few evenings ago two boats met somewhere this side of Providence, R. I., and both were badly crippled, and one went to the bottom. One hundred per cent of the two boats of course sank on that occasion. It was a terrific failure of good navigation. Thus it is that selecting two land offices in the whole United States and a bunch of cases collected from those the message undertakes to make an average for the 325,000 entries on the public domain. The record is shown by the Land Office to be, as I have heretofore stated it, that less than one-third of 1 per cent of the homestead entries have been found fraudulent in a period of eighteen years; that less than 1 per cent of the timber and stone entries, and less than 1 per cent of the coal entries, and less than 1 per cent of the desert-land entries, taking the country as a whole, have been found to be fraudulent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I rise just for a question, because I am entirely ignorant on this point.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FULTON. I can not yield for a speech. If the Senator wants to ask a question of the Senator from Montana, I will yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is not necessary for the Senator to yield at all. I do not intend to make a speech; and I will not ask the question if it is not agreeable to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. FULTON. I said I would yield for a question. I do not think the Senator has any occasion to get warm about this matter.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator is speaking in heat, and he appears to be warming the entire Senate.

Mr. FULTON. The Senator is mistaken. It is his own heat he feels. I am perfectly cool.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I feel a very warm wave from the Senator's direction. The Senator from Montana said it had been shown that one-third of 1 per cent only of the land entries in the last eighteen years were fraudulent. How many per cent have been shown to be fraudulent within the last three years?

Mr. CARTER. The number of entries found to be fraudu-

lent since 1900 are less than those found to be fraudulent prior to that period.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But what per cent of those that were made?

Mr. CARTER. I should in that case be permitted to explain to the Senator that there are two classes of entries. There is the mere filing, which is frequently abandoned by the individual altogether, through change of purpose or inability to live on the land. Then there is a final entry, wherein the party seeks to acquire title from the United States, and it is as to these final entries to which I have addressed myself.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I wish to say in concluding—this is no speech, I will say to my friend from Oregon—

Mr. FULTON. I will be the judge of that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. As I listened, it seemed curious to me that all this fraud had been perpetrated by the Government under the administration of the Interior Department. Perhaps not more than the Senator have I any very great feeling of personal friendship for the Secretary of the Interior; but his reputation throughout the country is that of rather rigid honesty—extremely rigid, I may say, and I honor him for it. Well, then, it does seem strange that all the fraud is being perpetrated by that Department. The Government, it seems, is the party that is engaged in wholesale fraud, and not the gentlemen here and there who are trying to get timber and stone. That is why I asked the question.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I deprecate calling in question the integrity or the motives of any public officer. I doubt always the propriety of that practice, and I have never felt personally inclined to indulge in it. As to the motives of the Secretary of the Interior I have ventured no opinion. As to the baseless ground upon which his action has been hypothesized from time to time I have commented. If I were going into the question of the integrity of his action all along the line, I should certainly scrutinize, before passing any judgment, his dealing with the railroad-land-grant companies.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I had not intended to include within my remarks this particular branch of the subject; but let me ask a question of the Senator from California [Mr. FLINT], who is the gentleman, I think, who injected this land-fraud discussion, aside from the forest-reserve frauds, into this debate. He said that vast amounts of fraud have been discovered at certain land offices under the desert act and under the homestead act, and under the timber and stone act, I think the Senator said.

Mr. FLINT. No.

Mr. FULTON. What acts did the Senator indicate?

Mr. FLINT. The desert-land act.

Mr. FULTON. Very well, under the desert-land act or any other act. What signifies that, Mr. President? Simply because frauds have been perpetrated under a particular act, is it necessary to withdraw the land from public entry and sale? Is it necessary to build a fence around the entire public domain simply because we find some persons have sought to take undue advantage of the Government in securing land contrary to the provisions of the law?

Now, what I am talking about and what I am opposing is the creation of these enormous forest reserves within the limits of a State, the result of which is to cripple the development and to throttle the industries and the growth of that State.

I would have no objection, Mr. President, if these forest reserves were confined to the summits and sides of the mountains, to that portion of the land that is unfitted and unsuited for settlement and cultivation, or to reservations necessary to protect the sources of streams. I would have no objection to that; aye, more, I would approve it. I believe there are certain portions of the timber area that may be properly, profitably, and wisely converted into reserves. But what I am talking about and that of which I am complaining is the vast area of valuable agricultural lands and grazing lands that are being incorporated into these reserves contrary to the spirit of the law, contrary to the intention and the purpose of Congress when the laws were enacted.

Indeed, the law to-day says that agricultural lands shall not be incorporated in the reserves; and yet the senior Senator from California [Mr. PERKINS] has shown that it became necessary to provide for taking up homesteads within those reserves, because agricultural lands were, notwithstanding the provisions of the law, incorporated into the reserves in violation of the law.

But, Mr. President, I am speaking of the continual aggression, the continual expansion of this particular Bureau by reason of its own efforts. Not only has it ignored the law in regard to the character of lands that are to be incorporated within

forest reserves, but there is a graver question, I submit to the Senate, and particularly to the members from the West, to be considered than any I have yet mentioned.

However, before passing to that I want to call the attention of Senators to the fact that it does not follow simply because a tract of land is heavily timbered that it is unfit for agriculture; and yet that is what is held by this Department. They say that a tract of land is chiefly valuable for timber if it has timber on it; that the only condition in which it is not chiefly valuable for timber is when it has no timber on it; and yet every person who has had any experience from living in timbered region knows that some of the finest agricultural land in the world is land that in its native state is covered with even a heavy growth of timber.

Take the States of Ohio and Indiana, for instance. In their original state they were heavily timbered; there were large forests and valuable forests; and yet those forests before the settler's ax have disappeared as the mist before the rising sun. First succeeded the settler's cabin; then the settler's clearing; then the farmer's dwelling, and the American home, and the American farm, and the American village, and the city, and, finally, all the resulting industries that make those two States to-day one of the centers of our splendid industrial and commercial life.

Now, let me ask the Senator from Indiana before he retires—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I shall not retire for long.

Mr. FULTON. Would he be willing to tear down these farmers' dwellings, to wipe out these farms, to dismantle these cities, to do away with these great throbbing industries that have lent such character and reputation to his State, and reforest the lands, or reforest one-fourth of them, at the expense of the splendid industries that have been built up by reducing the timbered lands to cultivation? Would he be willing to do that? I know he would not; and hence he ought to be able to appreciate somewhat the feelings of the people of the West, whose territory is being so seriously circumscribed by laws of this character administered in this manner.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Why, Mr. President, the Senator asked me a question, and from the fullness of his question he might just as well have asked me, or any other Senator, whether we would be in favor of the San Francisco earthquake.

Mr. FULTON. That is exactly what I thought, Mr. President.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Has the Senator had any city that has been dismantled in Oregon? Has he had any city whose "throbbing industries" and "giant enterprises"—

Mr. FULTON. There will not be room for many such if there are any more forest reserves created.

Mr. BEVERIDGE (continuing). Whose "giant enterprises" have been pulled down; and has he seen cities whose palaces and temples and marts of trade have been razed to the ground and forests reared on their sites of industry, beauty, and human happiness? Of course not. That is absurd.

Mr. FULTON. No; but I wish to say right there—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator asked me a question. I am not familiar with this matter, and the Senator is very familiar with it; but I will venture to say there has not been a genuine homesteader, who has applied for a homestead in any forest reserve where an acre of the soil was land that was fit for a homestead, whose application has been rejected. Can the Senator tell us of one?

Mr. FULTON. If the Senator from Indiana were going into agriculture, does he imagine that he would like to live within a forest reserve, that he would like to take his family off 20 or 30 miles from any settlement, without the possibility of school privileges or the possibility of any of the advantages of civilization? Because there is not a large rush of settlers to take up isolated tracts of agricultural land, does the Senator from Indiana think that is an argument against the possibility of any agricultural lands having been included in such reserves?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator asks me what I would do if I were in agriculture. I was in agriculture for a good portion of my life, and I will say to the Senator I had rather establish a home, provided the land were fit for the purposes of agriculture—which the Department is better able to judge of, scientifically administered, than some person who wants to take stone and wood out—of it for the real purpose of agriculture than I would to settle in the haphazard way of former times.

Why, Mr. President? Because if I were in the edge of such a forest reserve; if I were in one of those mountain meadows where no trees are, I would be certain of one thing at least, that my home would not be swept away by a forest fire. I would know, at the very least, that I would have all the protection of a carefully organized system of range guardianship; I would

know that I might not expect to find my home in ashes and my family burned to death while I was tilling the field. That is an answer to the Senator, even from my limited knowledge.

Now, will the Senator from Oregon answer—because he ought to know—whether he can cite one instance where a *bona fide* homesteader, who wanted to build an American home, applied for a homestead in any forest reserve where an acre of soil was such that it was fit for agriculture, that his application has been rejected?

Mr. CARTER. Will the Senator from Oregon permit me to put another question to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FULTON. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. I should like to ask the Senator from Indiana if he knows of a single application which was granted?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I asked the Senator from Oregon a question before the Senator from Montana asked me this question—I not being informed—and I ask him to answer my question, he being informed.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I will cheerfully answer and say that in the State of Montana, with its 146,000 square miles and practically one-third of the whole area in forest reserves, of the agricultural grazing lands, on which a tree does not grow and will never grow, I do not believe a single applicant has been accorded the privilege of making a homestead in a forest reserve.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Now, what kind of homes are these which the Senator from Oregon speaks of?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I have yielded to the Senator for a question, but I can not yield for a speech; and must go on with my remarks.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator from Oregon will have to yield to me now as much as possible, because I was called out of the Chamber and was about to go out, but remained at the personal demand of the Senator from Oregon, openly expressed, and the Senator, just as I was walking in front of him, advanced and halted my progress out of the Chamber, and he is now responsible for the fact that I am here.

Mr. FULTON. I want to say that the Senator has imposed a terrible responsibility on me. [Laughter.]

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Yes; I am aware of that; but in view of the fact that the Senator seems to be inviting a larger responsibility than I should want to assume, I should not think he would care to bear this slight extra burden. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULTON. I thank the Senator. I will undertake to travel along under the load.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator will have to. [Laughter.]

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, the Senator from Indiana has told us that he started out as a farmer and that he has been an agriculturist. I assume that it was on the beautiful land, the beautiful valleys, and the lovely hills of the State that he so ably represents. And yet, notwithstanding all that splendid environment, we find the Senator deserting the farm and leaving behind him all the beautiful and attractive influences which he has described and plunging into the pool of politics, and landing finally in the United States Senate. [Laughter.] Now, then, how long can we expect the Senator, if he has abandoned that character of farming, would remain on a farm away off in a forest reserve, 20 miles from any neighbor, where no one could hear his voice [laughter] and where he could not hear the voice of anybody else.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FULTON. For a question, as usual.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. No; the Senator will have to yield for more than a question.

Mr. FULTON. Well, then, Mr. President, I will not yield.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Then I will say this to the Senator: As the Senator asks me a question, he must give me time to answer it.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President—

Mr. BEVERIDGE. At least I will insist upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FULTON. I have asked the Senator no question since I questioned about reforesting his State, and he has fully explained his position as to that.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I was going to say that I would be willing to take up a homestead 20 miles away if I could get away from the voice of the Senator from Oregon.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Indiana is out of order.

Mr. FULTON. For a man who so dearly loves the sound of his own voice I can well understand that he would wish everybody else to be silent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I will not take time to say that I would

go 20 miles to get out of the sound of the Senator's voice. [Laughter.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon is entitled to the floor.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, there is just one other question I want to suggest which I started in to suggest a short time ago, which I think is the most important one to be considered in connection with the administration of the forest-reserve policy, and that is this: Not only are these vast areas of valuable agricultural grazing and timber lands to be withdrawn and converted into forest reserves so as to render it impossible for them to contribute to the industrial life or development of the State, but we are told now that the waters, the streams, the rivers, and the lakes with the forest reserves are to be hereafter administered and are to be hereafter used and enjoyed only in conformity with the rules and regulations of this Department, and not according to the laws of the States where they are situated. Why, Mr. President, I am told that to-day you can not get the privilege of taking water from a stream in a forest reserve for commercial or industrial purposes; that you can not apply the power of a stream for commercial or industrial purposes, unless you shall first get the license and the leave of the Forest Reserve Bureau, and pay an annual tax to swell the fund of which the Senator from Indiana has told us.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FULTON. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I call the attention of the Senator to the fact that this very bill provides that all the remaining lands fit for grazing outside of forest reserves are also to be put under the Forestry Service.

Mr. FULTON. Certainly. Whatever little there is left goes, but there is very little of it. But, Mr. President, by what authority, let me ask, is it proposed that the General Government shall determine the policy of an individual State touching the manner in which the waters and the water power of that State shall be employed, diverted, and appropriated? I am well aware, Mr. President, that in these later days there has sprung up a new school of philosophy, and that out of this school has been born a new class of constitutional interpreters. I understand, according to the doctrine of this school and according to the tenets of these philosophers, that the old State lines are absolutely wiped out and the reserved rights of the States that are guaranteed by the Constitution, that were recognized by Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson and Webster and Kent and Clay have fallen into "innocuous desuetude" and are not to be again revived.

Mr. President, I am not a strict constructionist. I have always believed, and I believe to-day, that by implication the General Government possesses all the necessary powers to protect its life and its existence and to administer and carry into effect its expressed or enumerated powers. I am not a disciple of Jefferson; rather do I belong to the school of Hamilton; but I say to you to-day that if the shade of Alexander Hamilton, the immortal, were to be brought unexpectedly up against a chunk of some of this modern constitutional logic the result would be something like the experience of Bret Harte's hero, who, we are told,

Smiled a sickly smile
And curled upon the floor,
And the subsequent proceedings
Interested him no more.

Sir, throughout our entire history as a nation the right to determine its own policy as to the use and application of the water of the streams within its borders, subject to the commerce clause of the Constitution, has been uniformly conceded to the States respectively. And it has ever been believed that he who harnessed the forces of nature and devoted them to supplying the power for industrial life and activity was a benefactor to mankind. He was esteemed as one who has caused a field of grain to grow on what had ever before been barren soil. But now we are told by this Bureau that a tax for the use of the General Government, a tax that will contribute to swell this extraordinary fund of which the Senator from Indiana tells us, must be levied upon the young and infant industries of all the public-land States. Are the Senators from Massachusetts, or from Ohio or Indiana, or from any of the Eastern, Southern, or Central States willing that this Bureau shall control the water power within their respective States? Are they willing that before their towns and cities can supply themselves with water for domestic purposes they must secure the consent and pay the annual tax imposed by this Bureau? Are they willing that before a plant can be established to supply or generate the power for a factory, a mill, or a lighting plant a charter must be secured from this Bureau and a tax must be paid to swell the

revenues of the General Government? That is exactly what the people in the forest-reserve States are being compelled to do to-day. I deny the power of this Government to impose any such restrictions on the people of Oregon. We were admitted as a State on an equality with the original States, and I deny the right of the General Government to impose exactions on us not imposed equally on the original States. I deny the right of the General Government, or of this Bureau, to withdraw permanently from settlement and sale the public lands within my State.

The truth is, this Bureau is composed of dreamers and theorists, but beyond and outside the domain of their theories and their dreams is the everyday, busy, bustling, throbbing world of human endeavor, where real men are at work producing substantial results. I know something of the importance of the home builder to the State. I know far better than does this bureau chief the obstacles the home builder will overcome and the hardships he will endure to secure for himself and family an abiding place. While these chiefs of the Bureau of Forestry sit within their marble halls and theorize and dream of waters conserved, forests and streams protected and preserved throughout the ages and the ages, the lowly pioneer is climbing the mountain side where he will erect his humble cabin, and within the shadow of the whispering pines and the lofty firs of the western forest engage in the laborious work of carving out for himself and his loved ones a home and a dwelling place. It is of him I think and for him I take my stand to-day.

On some more convenient occasion I will propose an amendment to the existing law that will confine this Bureau within the limits to which it was originally designed by Congress that it should be confined.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, I do not desire to occupy more than a few moments in relation to the matters that have been discussed this morning and some matters which were discussed at the last session of the Senate. It is gratifying to find that the vein of levity and good cheer with which the annual criticism of the agricultural appropriation bill is made in the Senate has given place to a somewhat sober and considerate discussion of the practical questions involved in it.

I think it ought to be said on behalf of the Committee on Agriculture that the committee has for many years sought by degrees to raise the rank of the great bureaus of the Department of Agriculture and to give to those in charge of them salaries more commensurate with their learning and their usefulness in the public service. So in this bill the chiefs of the five great scientific bureaus of the Department of Agriculture have been put upon a uniform salary of \$5,000. That, it seems to me, is wise and just to all these men. The chiefs of the Weather Bureau, the Forestry Bureau, the Chemistry Bureau, and the Bureaus of Animal Industry and Plant Industry are men famous throughout the world for their contributions to practical science, and I believe it is not only an economy on the part of the Government to recognize the value of their services, but that it has become a necessity to do so if the Department is to retain the services of such men.

I think the criticism which has been directed against the Bureau of Forestry is especially to be deplored. I represent a portion of the country that by reason of its position can look without much prejudice upon the problems that confront the Government in its relation to the newer States, to which allusion has been made. I am certainly not without sympathy for the men and women who are laying the foundations of homes in the great States which have been in part covered up by forestry reservations under order of the President. I have taken the pains in traveling through these States to find out, if I could, what the basis of the antagonism that has grown up against the Government in the administration of the Bureau of Forestry actually is. I find very few intelligent men in any of these States who do not speak in enthusiastic terms of the Government's policy of reserving the great forests and the areas which they occupy. On the other hand, in all these States I found an undertone of criticism directed against the Department of the Interior and directed against the Bureau of Forestry, apparently based upon the idea that this far-reaching effort of our Government to preserve these lands for the future welfare of the people in some way contradicts the rights of the good people who are trying to make homes in these regions.

I make the suggestion here to the honorable Senators who have been pouring the vials of their wrath upon the Department of the Interior and upon the Bureau of Forestry that I do not believe the administration of these great Departments would refuse to consider a fair public showing of any injustice that has been done in the location of any of the forest reservations or to correct any errors into which the Government has by chance been misled; and I feel that some word ought to be

said here at least to indicate that there is no unanimous disposition of the Senate to condemn men who, like the Secretary of the Interior and after him the Secretary of Agriculture, have been going forward in the midst of many difficulties to perfect this great scheme to preserve those resources of nature upon which the permanence of civilization in these prosperous communities depends.

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I trust the Senator did not understand me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. FULTON. I trust the Senator did not understand me as criticising the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I did not. I had in mind a rather alarming concert of criticism which has from time to time been given expression here from the very beginning of this Congress. My interest in the public-land question is entirely national. As a citizen of the State in which I live, I certainly have no prejudices against the portion of our country farther west; but I undertake to say that whoever impeaches the integrity with which the Department of the Interior has been administered under Secretary Hitchcock ought at least to go in such details as will enable those of us who are without information to judge more accurately.

No man connected with this Government, in my recollection, has won a more unique recognition than he. Institutions of learning, the greatest in our land, have decorated him with honorary degrees, not because of his learning in the law, but because of his integrity—his dogged effort to interpret the Ten Commandments. On the other hand, here in the Senate and in the other House of Congress we find a petulant stream of criticism directed at the integrity of his motives and the wisdom with which he has undertaken to administer the great trust which has reposed upon him during the last eight years. However, it is no part of my purpose to defend him; but I undertake to say that he has by his public service piled up a mountainous presumption of plain honesty which is not to be overcome by speeches upon the floor of either House of Congress.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I think the Senator from Iowa upon reflection will recall that the criticism which has been directed against the Secretary of the Interior has not been as to his integrity, although there has been much criticism—and probably more may yet be expressed—as to the wisdom and judgment of the Secretary of the Interior in matters such as these.

Of course it may be that the great institutions of learning situated in the Eastern States on the shores of the Atlantic know more about the Secretary of the Interior and his actions in the Western States than the Senators on this floor who represent those States, but I should always accept the judgment of those in the States where the results of the administration of the Secretary of the Interior are most in evidence.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Mr. President, that is my disposition also, and I should be glad to do it in the case of this forestry controversy if it had not fallen in my way to dig a little under this testimony of debate into certain testimony that was laid before the Committee on Agriculture in the course of a very recent investigation. You would suppose from such an utterance as was made by my honored friend from Oregon [Mr. FULTON] that the administration of the Forestry Bureau had operated to destroy the opportunities, to handicap the resources, and to prevent the growth of business in the great areas that have been affected by these forest reservations.

The other day there strolled into the Committee on Agriculture about as lively a group of typical Americans as I have ever had the opportunity to meet here or anywhere else. They were representatives from all these States affected by the forestry reservations. They were farmers; they were cattle raisers; they were horse ranchmen; they were sheepmen, and they were men of brawn as well as of brain, fully aware of the industrial conditions that surround them in the great communities in which they live.

Mr. CARTER. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. I call the Senator's attention to the fact that one of these representative citizens admitted that he had 500,000 acres of land under one fence, and that he had a large area besides in the Territory of Arizona and another large area in the Territory of New Mexico. Another one of these

representative citizens, speaking for the homesteaders, of course the actual settlers, had with his associates an area 300 miles in length and 100 miles in width under fence in the Territory of New Mexico, and he was up here pleading for the maintenance of his fence and, of course, for the maintenance of the homestead.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Not at all. He was pleading for the application to the desert pasture lands of the United States of the exact administration that has for years been in operation in respect to the forest reservations. While a good many of those gentlemen who came before the committee were great cattlemen, there came also men from the small ranches. I recall a small dealer from a mountain fastness in Colorado, whose little ranch was upon a creek and whose pasture was upon the mountain side, and he spoke, I think, as a representative of practically the whole system of cattle raising of the mountain regions of the United States. His name was Gray. Among other things, in answer to a question suggested by me, referring to the regulation of these mountain pastures, he said:

Senator PERKINS. And you think an act of Congress permitting the Government to lease you the land is in the interest of law and order and good government?

Mr. GRAY. We in that section of the country prefer what is known as the permit system. I want to explain that point, and I am very glad you brought it out. The permit system will work very much better for this one reason: We have to turn our stock out away down on the low foothills in the spring of the year, because the snow has not yet gone off high up on the mountains. We have to turn them all out together. Our ranges are bounded by valleys. We turn them out there; and as the snow goes off—gradually clears away—up in the mountains, in July, August, September, and October, our cattle get clear up to timber line, often going as high as 12,000 feet. If you adopt a lease system in that country—if you leased to each individual a very long, narrow strip up through the mountains, it would be impracticable to use it. We would prefer a community interest, where fifteen or twenty or twenty-five of us could have a permit to run so many cattle in there, bounded by natural streams—

Senator LONG. And no sheep men allowed. [Laughter.]

Mr. GRAY. Well, there are not any there, as has been said a number of times; the altitude is too high.

Senator LONG. It is not healthy for them?

Mr. GRAY. It is not healthy.

Senator DOLLIVER. But that can be regulated by the Department?

Mr. GRAY. It can be regulated by the Department. It is regulated upon the forest reserves, and it was a godsend to us when we got the forest reserve there.

Senator DOLLIVER. I wish you would get somebody to make a statement to that effect in the Senate.

Mr. GRAY. Well, I can do it. [Great laughter.] I am doing it right here.

Senator PERKINS. I wish Senator Heyburn was here.

Mr. GRAY. I know these conditions, because I have been there for over thirty years.

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Iowa yield to me for a moment?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. I have been something of a farmer myself, all my life.

I know something about forests in a general way, and my experience, and I think the experience of all my neighbors in Minnesota, has been that the worst thing you can do to a forest is to pasture it with cattle and sheep. If you want to raise timber, if you want to raise a good forest and have it grow rapidly and do well, you do not want to pasture it with sheep or cattle at all. And here, by permission of the Forestry Bureau, we are just loading these forest reserves with sheep and cattle. I do not see how that can help the production of timber on the forest reserves.

Mr. DOLLIVER. If my honored friend, the Senator from Minnesota, will permit me, I will call his attention to a statement made on that subject by a gentleman by the name of Jastro, from Bakersfield, Cal., who lives upon the edge of one of the great forest reserves of California.

Mr. CARTER. If the Senator will permit me, that is the 500,000-acre gentleman to whom I referred.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes, sir. And he seems to have a certificate of very high moral character from my honored friend from California.

Mr. CARTER. He was entitled to it, of course. His morals are exceptionally good.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Now, hear what he says:

I believe that pretty much every man in California would be willing to see the public ranges controlled by the Government; and I say this for the reason that our experience with the forest reserves that we created in California has been that since the formation of the forest reserves in the State of California our rivers have given us nearly 25 per cent more water to irrigate lands with. It has kept these roaming herds of cattle and migratory bands of sheep out of the mountains and out of the plains. They have not tramped our country up; they have not destroyed our native grasses, so that our country is being reseeded; and to-day California carries more stock than she did before there was any forest reserve. That is, I am speaking now of the amount of stock she carries outside of the places where forage is provided for stock.

Mr. PERKINS. I only want to say, if my friend will permit me, in answer to the Senator from Montana, that this gentleman who was referred to by my colleague said that he had formerly resided in Montana, had pastured his sheep on land in that State, and had finally come to the golden State of California. Therefore he brought his certificate of character from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. I think the gentleman referred to stated that he was driven out of California by the drought, and came to Montana and pastured his sheep.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I have the testimony of a gentleman from Wyoming to which I should like to call the attention of my friend the Senator from Wyoming. I have the greatest confidence in him, but my confidence in him is in his capacity as a statesman and not as a ranchman or a man practically interested in the business.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask a question for information. Is the Government of the United States engaged in sheep farming as a means for the preservation of forests?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will say to the Senator from Rhode Island that in these forest areas there are, in the very necessity of the case, large vacant spaces good for pasture, and under regulations, under a lease system, sheep are pastured and cattle are pastured in such numbers as not to destroy either the forest or the pasture, but to preserve both and to help everybody connected with the proposition. As will be shown by this testimony—

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. FULTON. The Senator, I think, does not fully explain that rent is charged by the General Government for the pasturage.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. FULTON. In other words, exactly the condition that the interrogatory of the Senator from Rhode Island suggested prevails—the Government is engaged in the sheep-pasture business. The Government is engaged in business in these States.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Government owns these lands—

Mr. LODGE. I should like to ask for information whether the Government owns the sheep?

Mr. FULTON. No; but the Government is engaged in pasturing the sheep.

Mr. DOLLIVER. The Government is engaged in the land business, but is not in the sheep business.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair calls the attention of Senators to the rule that before interrupting a Senator they must first obtain recognition by the Chair.

Mr. LODGE. I will ask the Senator if he will yield to me—

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. As I understand it, the Government rents certain available pasture lands in the forest reserves for the purpose of pasturage.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Yes, sir; and it takes the money to keep up the reserves—to build little improvements.

Mr. LODGE. The Government is not engaged in business.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. HEMENWAY. How long has the Government taken this money to keep up the reserves?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I think it has been doing it for several years.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Prior to 1905 all of this money went into the Treasury of the United States and Congress appropriated directly for the care of the reserves.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is true, and I do not know that I question the wisdom of that proceeding; but I am now talking about what appears to me to be a concerted scheme to discredit and disparage what I regard as one of the great practical scientific operations of the Government.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. I desire to contribute a fact, to the end that statements may be made accurately here. The Government does not lease any area of land in forest reserves.

Mr. DOLLIVER. That is true.

Mr. CARTER. It grants to owners of various kinds of stock permits, which allow those owners to graze stock in the reservations at so much a head throughout a stipulated number of months each year.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Iowa yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. DOLLIVER. Certainly.

Mr. CLAY. Will the Senator let me call his attention to one provision of this bill? I can not believe that the Senator from Iowa can approve this provision of the bill, found on page 71:

And hereafter, for the purpose of restoring, protecting, and increasing the grazing value of the public domain, and promoting the agricultural use thereof, the Secretary of Agriculture may organize grazing districts and regulate and control grazing upon the unappropriated, unreserved lands of the United States, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, may issue permits or grant leases for periods not exceeding ten years, and charge and collect reasonable fees for grazing thereon, the receipts to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the special fund obtained from charges for timber, grazing, and other resources of the national forests and provided for by section 5 of the act of February 1, 1905.

I desire to call the Senator's attention to the fact that this is the broadest feature I have ever seen in a bill. Under these provisions the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized, if he desires to do so, to lease to a dozen persons the entire forest lands of the United States and the grazing lands outside of the forests, and he is also authorized to lease them at such prices as he may deem proper. You place in the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture the power to employ a million men, if he desires to do so, and to fix their salaries. You authorize him, if he desires to do so, to lease all of these lands to a few people.

If you are going to authorize these lands to be leased, by all means, I say to the Senator, we ought to provide how much shall be leased to one person, and what shall be the prices, and we also ought to provide that there should be an accounting to Congress every session of how much money had been received and how the expenditures have been made.

I am frank to say, Mr. President, that I have never read a looser piece of legislation than this on page 71 of the pending bill. This is absolutely getting to be a Government of one-man power. Congress has ceased to act, and is leaving the entire administration of the law, and practically the making of the law, to a few persons. Congress itself ought to act in a matter of this importance.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I do not intend to take up the question raised by the section of the bill to which the Senator from Georgia has alluded, although it is proper for me to say that I am in favor of exactly that thing, and I hope, in cooperation with others, to convince not only my friend, the Senator from Georgia, but everybody else that that is a proper disposition of these semiarid lands of the United States.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Do I understand the Senator from Iowa to say that he believes in allowing the public lands, including those embraced in forest reserves, to be leased for grazing purposes, the money to go into a fund and be permanently appropriated, which the Secretary of Agriculture may absolutely control without Congress making annual appropriations for that purpose?

Mr. DOLLIVER. I will not debate that question. That is a very interesting question of detail as to the administration of the fund, which I think we can get some agreement upon later.

But I desire now, in brief, if Senators will permit me, to add the testimony of C. E. Ayer, esq., of Dixon, Wyo., who is not only a stockman, but, as he testified, a sheep man, residing in one of these wonderful little valleys. He says:

Last year we had the Park Range Forest Reserve that has been organized, and this last summer we got permits to graze our cattle on that forest reserve, and we are well pleased with the manner in which it was done. But the whole territory not being forest reserve, it does not protect us in the spring and in the fall and in the winter; and while we could get along fairly well as far as the winter part of it is concerned, the spring and fall range we must have, because we can not feed our cattle on the forest reserve in the spring and in the fall. We can feed them in the winter time; and these large herds of steers will come in there, ten or twelve thousand head, belonging to one man or one company, and they are just about as big a detriment to us as the large herds of sheep. We have had some trouble with the sheep men, but I am glad to say that in the last summer, owing to the control of the Park Range Forest Reserve, we did not have any trouble at all; and we are well paid for what it cost us for our permits, 20 cents a head, in not having to have any scraps with the sheep men.

Here is the statement of Mr. Bell, a cattleman, and also a sheepman, from Wyoming.

Mr. PERKINS. He is a farmer.

Mr. DOLLIVER. Undoubtedly; in which he pays to the administration of the forest reservations, under Mr. Pinchot, a very appropriate and just eulogy in recognition of the efficiency of the service:

Senator LATIMER. We are just trying to find out what you want.

Mr. BELL. Well, God bless you, then—we are just willing to tell

you, if you will let us. That is the idea. I simply want to tell you that you would naturally infer from some statements made here that the cattlemen want it because the sheepmen do not want it. I want to tell you, as a sheepman and a cattleman and as a farmer, that at a reasonable price—at a reasonable price, such as we can make a living at, and a sufficient number of acres—I am frank to say to you that I indorse a proposition of this kind. That is, I indorse it if you could just get it in that way and put it in the hands of men who are big enough in mind, who are fair enough to do justice to all of us. The fact of the business is that I have learned to like Mr. Pinchot so much that I have been accused of falling in love with him and asking to have him adopt me. Now, I would be willing to have him adopt me if—

Senator PERKINS. But you are not willing for him to fix the rate he should charge you. [Laughter.]

Mr. BELL. Yes, sir; if he will go through my section of country and find out the conditions there I would be perfectly willing for Mr. Pinchot to fix the rate.

Senator PERKINS. Then we are all satisfied. We are going to leave this to the Secretary of Agriculture, to whom you have paid such a high tribute, after you learned his name [laughter], and he is going to bring our friend Mr. Pinchot in to assist him in advising you as to the rate you shall pay; and Mr. Pinchot is going to ask you and your other neighbors what is right, and then he will draw his own judgment and conclusions.

Mr. BELL. Well, Mr. Pinchot has been fair to our particular part of the country. We paid 5½ cents for sheep, and we have understood that they will let us go in there for 4 cents this year. We appreciate that, and we think that they are now 2 cents too high. I really believe that, too. But we appreciate what he has done for us.

Senator FRAZIER. The lower he fixes the price the more you like him. [Laughter.]

Mr. BELL. I am frank to say, gentlemen, that I am mortal, and a man can do more with me by being extremely friendly than he can by abusing me. There is no question about that; and the evidence of that is that if Mr. Pinchot does favor me justly—I am not asking him to give it to me—why, of course it would not make me dislike him, would it? There is nothing wrong about that, is there?

Senator FRAZIER. No.

Let me also call attention to the testimony of Mr. T. J. Walsh, one of the most interesting and most able men in the State of Montana, who was delegated to come here by the National Woolgrowers' Association. He was not exactly pleased with the forest reservation regulations in respect to the charge made for the grazing of sheep, but he speaks in terms which seem to contradict the opinion that the forest regulations have impeded the settlement of the State of Montana. He says:

There is no portion of the State of Montana that is cropped to death; and manifestly it is just as good range for the man who takes up the homestead as it is for the stock of the cattle company that is engaged in grazing there. If it will furnish feed for the cattle company's stock it will furnish feed for the homesteader's stock. And so it is, sir, that the land is being constantly taken up; and you can refer to the statistics of the land officers of our State, and confirm the statement that more homesteads are being taken up within the last four or five years than, I believe, ever before in the history of the State. Congress within that period has created two new land districts in our State, at Great Falls and Miles City.

He adds a few words which fully explain his grievance against the forestry law:

Senator DOLLIVER. Has the forest-reserve system of leasing worked well in your section of the country?

Mr. WALSH. It has been entirely unsatisfactory, for the reason that I indicate to you. Now, understand, in our community there is not the slightest opposition to the preservation of the forests. Any assistance that any of us can give toward that end will be cheerfully given. But we do, sir, object to being called upon to pay for the privilege that everybody else from time immemorial has had without paying, and we do object simply to putting in the hands of these officers the power to say whether we shall or shall not carry on our business.

I have thus briefly referred to this testimony because I believe it will do us good to get a gleam of light from these hills which is not dimmed at all by the atmosphere of debate and controversy which goes on in the two Houses of Congress.

I will add another word. There must be some deep-seated reason for the difficulty which the Secretary of the Interior has had in administering the land laws of the United States. While I deprecate any disposition to indict whole communities, whole States, and charge their people with fraudulent attempts to evade and nullify the land laws of the United States, I believe the time will come when these faithful officers who have called attention to the violation of the law will receive a better recognition for the services which they have rendered the people than they have thus far received in the Senate. For among these witnesses, representative men appointed by great cattle associations who came before the committee, at least one of them dropped the suggestion that in one favored section of the cattle country a majority of the people who were coming in to settle upon lands were not entitled to the honorable distinction of being homesteaders, laying the foundations for homes and for civilization, but he said they were settlers who had come from various cities in near-by States for the purpose of entering those lands with a view of afterwards selling them, and were in reality speculators, using the land laws of the United States to work a fraud upon the Government. While I should be the last one to lay a charge against whole communities, I desire it to be understood that if it becomes necessary to defend the motives and the integrity of responsible public officials, the question will not be decided until the real facts

appear as to how in all these years the land laws of the United States have been used by speculators, big and little, for the purpose of covering transactions so nearly akin to fraud as to warrant the vigilance and attention of more than one department of the Government.

Mr. PROCTOR obtained the floor.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly.

Mr. WARREN. I wish to ask the Senator from Iowa if it is not a fact that ever since there have been public lands and public land laws men have taken ranches and sold them afterwards and taken farms and sold them afterwards? I want to say that when I was engaged for a time, in the year 1868, in the State of Iowa, which the Senator so ably represents, I found men coming from the New England States and elsewhere and taking up homesteads with the avowed purpose of some time selling them and going back to their own homes.

Mr. DOLLIVER. They made a great error if they did that.

Mr. WARREN. Just so. Not so many of them went back as expected to in the first place, owing to the satisfaction they found in Iowa. But it is true, nevertheless, and it will always be true as long as we have any land laws, that a man will take up a homestead for the purpose of owning his own home, or trading it for another, or selling it when he gets ready, or occupying it, as he sees fit, and it never has been considered fraudulent to do so.

There has been fraud ever since there have been land laws, and there always will be. The only difference has been that the frauds of earlier years were prosecuted by the officers of the Department without so much fuss and notoriety through the newspapers, and it has not always been understood that a man was a thief until he had proved himself innocent. Things must have come to a pretty pass when it is assumed in a great Department that every man who undertakes under the law to take up land agreeably to the law must be considered a thief until he has proved himself innocent; must live on a homestead all of his natural life before he can be recognized as an honest man. There has not been more fraud in the last few years than there was in the previous ten years, or the previous twenty years, or the previous twenty-five years, considering the total number of land claims offered for proof.

Mr. DOLLIVER. I accidentally ran across an old Iowa friend in a far western State with a homestead located in a forest where there were trees 5 or 6 feet in diameter and so thick that you could not get among them with a wagon. And he was proving up under the homestead law.

Mr. WARREN. He had a right to.

Mr. DOLLIVER. And he wanted me to intercede for him in the Department because they held him up for examination.

Mr. WARREN. A great many men in Iowa, Michigan, Illinois, and other States have proved up upon their homesteads when they had to cut out the trees of the forest before they could plant crops.

Mr. DOLLIVER. But they did not have to tackle trees such as those on my old friend's farm in the Pacific country.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PROCTOR. After I have made a few remarks.

Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the salary of the Chief Forester.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PROCTOR. I must decline to yield to anyone for the moment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Vermont declines to yield.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, the question before the Senate is the salary of the Chief of this Bureau. I do not see that there is any great question but that the head of this Bureau should receive the increased salary. If he does not do his duty, or if a Cabinet officer does not do his duty, we do not reduce the salary. We have other ways of reaching the difficulty. We can cut off the appropriation or make any new law that will remedy the evil.

There are other amendments and other sections in the bill to which the arguments we have heard would apply with more force and directness than to this question of salary. I was merely going to suggest that unless the reservoir of eloquence is inexhaustible, as I must confess it rather seems to be, it would lead to a repetition perhaps of a good deal that is now being discussed, and I should be glad, if Senators agree with me,

if the matter could be left until we reach the sections especially applying to this service.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is just for a word. I do not want to make a speech.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield?

Mr. PROCTOR. I do.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I fully agree with the point made by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. Proctor]. I think it is apparent that the whole discussion should have arisen on an amendment which will occur later in the bill, but it did arise partly upon this. In view of what has been said during the day, it will become necessary for me, when that amendment has been reached, to say what it had been my purpose to say immediately. But I think it must be clear to all that rather than upon the mere question of the salary of the Chief Forester, as to which practically everybody is agreed, it would be better to postpone the remainder of the argument, as it would have been far better in the first place to postpone all the argument until we reach those amendments upon which it more properly arises.

Therefore I shall not ask to say anything at this time, but shall wait until those amendments are reached.

Mr. PATTERSON. I should like to say a few words on the subject of the salary before the Senator from Vermont has his last word in his appeal to the Senate to vote on the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. PROCTOR. Certainly, I yield to the Senator from Colorado to discuss the question before the Senate.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I desire to call the attention of the Senate to some matters connected with the administration of the officer whose salary is now under consideration. The Senator from Iowa [Mr. DOLLIVER] stated that in traveling through the West he found here adverse criticisms and there strong approbation of the Forestry Bureau and of the administration of its affairs in the western country. So far as I am concerned I do not intend to indulge, and I never have indulged, in widespread or unlimited adverse criticism either of the forestry system or of the administration. I am inclined to think that the adverse criticism made has been against what we may term the overzealousness of the head of the Bureau and of those who are under him rather than to his intentions and purposes and the end that is sought to be attained.

The trouble with the administration of the Forestry Service is that it enters into the business and affairs and the very lifeline of every man who has anything to do with the forest regions and who is engaged in business of any kind that carries him to those regions. He is met on almost every hand by an agent of this Bureau. He is required to pay tribute in the meanest, smallest, pettiest sums, as well as in very large sums, to this Bureau, under the pretense that the Government is entitled to compensation for what anybody uses which belongs to the Government, and that it is a wrong inflicted upon the Government to tread even upon the public domain within the forest reserves without giving compensation for the privilege.

As an evidence of the zeal with which these petty persecutions are carried on by the very great or almost numberless crowd of local timber agents, I desire to call attention to a matter which was recently called to my attention through the mails. I have here a very short letter written from Winfield, Colo., addressed to me, which is as follows:

Inclosed please find letter to me from timber agent, forest reserve, which speaks for itself; looks like graft. It also appears that these officers have wonderful discretionary powers giving even opportunity to rake off in adjusting the sums to be paid, and I hear of some of my neighbors who were told by the agent they did not have to pay at all. It is not true that I am one of only three who refused to sign, as stated in the letter; only three have signed it here, and then under protest.

With my neighbors thanking you sincerely for the interest and stand you have taken in this matter, I remain,

Very truly, yours,

WILLIAM WALLACE.

I call the attention of the Senate to the letter which he inclosed to me from W. H. Hazzard, who signs himself deputy forest ranger. In this letter he inclosed a printed form for a lease or permit, to be signed by the gentleman who wrote me the letter. The thing that he wanted to lease to the writer was a cabin, an abandoned cabin on the public domain, which was taken up by the writer, who is a prospector. In all probability it was a small, rough, dirt-roof cabin, such as are scattered throughout the entire mining sections of the country. They are built by prospectors when they intend to remain in some locality for a period of time. If they move, the cabins are abandoned. Somebody else succeeds them and he takes possession. The

mountains are filled with just such cabins, and here is a forest ranger, one of the employees of the head of this Bureau, who demands that this prospector shall pay to the Government of the United States three dollars and a half for the privilege of occupying this cabin, or the holder will be evicted under the rules and regulations of the Bureau. The miner will be compelled to move on and some fellow willing to pay the paltry sum of \$3.50 will be permitted to take his place.

There are things in this letter which is written by this forest ranger which indicate to my mind that the charge of graft contained in the letter of my correspondent is not altogether without substance.

Mr. TILLMAN. What becomes of the three dollars and a half?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. PATTERSON. I have yielded, and the Senator from South Carolina is through. I will talk about that in a moment.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. GALLINGER. I want simply to inquire who appoints these rangers and deputy rangers? Are they appointed here in Washington by the Bureau?

Mr. PATTERSON. I suppose so; by the head of the Bureau. Mr. Wallace had received a letter a month before he received this. He inclosed one of the leases in the first letter under which he was to pay the Government \$5 a year to occupy this cabin. He wrote a letter to me and I answered it, and I appealed to the Department here at Washington. To that appeal I have no recollection of having received a reply. Mr. Wallace wrote that fact to Mr. Hazzard, and the letter I now read was written by Hazzard on receiving that information:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
FOREST SERVICE,
Winfield, Colo., November 15, 1906.

Mr. WILLIAM WALLACE, Winfield, Colo.

DEAR SIR: I am again presenting to you an application for special privilege agreement for the cabin you are occupying at Winfield. You will note that I have reduced the charges from \$5 per annum to \$3.50. I do this because you occupy but the one cabin and utilize same wholly as a personal enterprise.

I have been advised by the Leadville office to post notices on all cabins at Winfield and elsewhere, where parties refuse to take out a privilege for same, stating they are Government property. Therefore I will be at liberty to grant a privilege for the cabin you are occupying to anyone that may make application for same. As to the protest that has been sent in to Washington, I do not know what action, if any, will be taken. However, your signing the inclosed agreement will in no way bind you to pay the charges stipulated therein, as we intend to treat everybody alike in this matter. If the Washington office recommends no charges for cabins at Winfield, you will not have to pay.

You are only one of three that have refused to sign the agreement. We are anxious to send them all in to the Washington office. Kindly procure the names of two witnesses to the agreement, signing same, and return to me.

Very truly, yours,

W. H. HAZZARD,
Deputy Forest Ranger.

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. Do I understand that Winfield is a mining camp or something like that, or did the Government build these cabins?

Mr. PATTERSON. The Government never spent a cent, and no agent of the Government ever performed a minute's labor upon them.

Mr. TILLMAN. Some prospectors running around hunting minerals built the cabins and moved on, and now the Government wants to rent them?

Mr. PATTERSON. Yes. The agent of the Government wants to rent them, and posts notices upon them that if the occupants do not pay the rent they will be compelled to get out and somebody else will be given possession.

Mr. TILLMAN. Suppose a man built a cabin of his own, would they demand rent for that?

Mr. PATTERSON. Of course, upon the theory that, being on the Government domain, they have a right to compel him to pay rent.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is better for them to rent—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. It is better for them to rent cabins than to have the cabins rot, is it not?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, the cabins are built under a common usage in that country by the prospectors, and when they move on a cabin is left for anybody who will to occupy it as though he had been the original builder. It is a thing with which the Government has no right to interfere. It is a mean,

little, pestiferous kind of persecution, and it ought to carry mortification to every Government officer rather than to receive our approval.

But I call the attention of the Senate to this singular postscript that is at the end of this letter:

In taking out this privilege you will be exempt from paying any county taxes.

Pray, by what authority was a Government ranger authorized to write to the occupant of a cabin on the public domain, that was built either by the prospector or by others, and say, "If you will pay the three dollars and a half, you will not be compelled to pay any county tax?" Does it not give color to the charge which was made in the letter by my correspondent that it looks like there was graft in the matter; that other than a zeal to help the Government inspires these agents to make such demands?

Of course, as to whether that conclusion is right or not, I do not know. I make no charge, but I do not hesitate to say that the manner of the administration of the forest reserves has done more to bring the whole system into disrepute than anything else. The rules and regulations of Mr. Pinchot have been in effect in Colorado now, I think, a year. The cattlemen and the sheepmen entered into an understanding with Mr. Pinchot in good faith to try the system, to meet the demands that were made upon them by the Government in the shape of license fees for ranging their cattle and sheep in the forest reserves. Within the past week I have received resolutions from three or four cattle organizations denouncing the entire system, declaring that they have received no benefit whatever from it, and that they feel that the manner in which this reserve proposition is enforced is an imposition upon the cattlemen as well as the citizens of the State generally.

The truth of it is, Mr. President, this whole Forest Reserve Bureau sprung up from a statute about four or five or six lines in extent. It simply provided that the President might declare forest reserves, and that they would be created for a special purpose—for the purpose of conserving the waterfall, to save the waters for the benefit of the agriculturists, and also to conserve and preserve the timber. There was not a word in the statute about leasing the forest reserves to cattlemen or to sheepmen. There is not a word in the law about executing leases or permits. The law to-day is absolutely bald of any such authority or permission.

And yet we find the Department claiming the power that has been devolved upon Congress by the Constitution in two important particulars. Congress alone may levy and collect taxes, and Congress alone may dispose of the public domain.

Yet, Mr. President, we have this Bureau levying and collecting taxes in the shape of license fees, and shutting men out, with their cattle and other live stock, from the forest reserves unless they pay these taxes to the agents of the Government; and we find the Department executing permits or leases, which is pro tanto a disposition of the public domain, and such disposition belongs entirely to Congress.

Congress has delegated to this Bureau neither the right to levy taxes, whether they may be in the shape of licenses or otherwise, nor to dispose in any way of the public domain.

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. PATTERSON. With pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the Senator whether there is any portion of the land included in the forest reserves of his State that will be available for other purposes than grazing. Will it be available, for instance, for farm purposes or other industrial purposes?

Mr. PATTERSON. There is no doubt about that in the world. There is no great area of the State that does not contain a greater or less amount of good farming land and good grazing land, but they include within the boundaries of the forest reserves all lands within them without reference to the uses to which they can be put.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But, Mr. President—

Mr. ALDRICH. Does the Senator understand that the administration of this Department is restricted to the leasing of these lands to people who occupy very large areas?

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, no.

Mr. ALDRICH. But as a matter of fact do they lease them to small farmers who want to lease, say, 30, 40, or 100 acres?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, it is not a leasing in fact. It is a privilege that is granted to stock owners to allow their cattle to range within certain areas at so much per head, and the cattle of a number of the companies or individuals may graze within this area and intermingle.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President, I hope the Senator—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. BEVERIDGE. The Senator has asked a question—

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask, in this connection, another question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. PATTERSON. With pleasure.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the Senator a question for information. I do not ask, of course, for the information unless he knows himself. I ask if a small farmer would desire the privilege, for instance, of farming 30 or 40 acres of this land, does he understand it would be possible for him to secure that privilege?

Mr. PATTERSON. I think it would be, but I think the rules and regulations do not contemplate arrangements of that kind between the Government and farmers.

Mr. ALDRICH. For industrial purposes also, I suppose?

Mr. PATTERSON. No; they only exercise this privilege for grazing purposes.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PATTERSON. With pleasure.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I think the statement should be made to the Senator from Rhode Island, in connection with his question, that the whole forest reserve or any part thereof is open to the homestead privilege, and that the homestead privilege is granted where, in the opinion of the Bureau or Department, the land is properly adapted to agriculture and where the proof of the claim is not fraudulent. Further than that, with reference to the grazing, I call the Senator's attention to the following language of the bill, page 2—

Mr. PATTERSON. I am not discussing the grazing feature.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. But the Senator from Rhode Island asked the question.

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not want to have my remarks interrupted for the purpose of discussing the grazing feature of the bill. We will take that up when we reach it.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I know—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PATTERSON. I do not want to be discourteous at all, but I do not want the grazing controversy to enter into this.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. Nor do I.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PATTERSON. I will yield to the Senator.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Colorado yields to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. BEVERIDGE. I did not think there was any particular question about that. Then it should be stated to the Senator from Rhode Island, who asked the question about these vast grazing privileges and asked it repeatedly, that the preference is given to the homesteaders by the language.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to hear the language read.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am really very glad that this question of privilege of taking up homesteads within the forest reserves has been broached.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. PATTERSON. I do.

Mr. CARTER. The statement of law, as made by the Senator from Indiana, is not the statement of the law, but it is the statement of a proposed law embraced in this bill.

Mr. PATTERSON. I am glad the question of the right in the citizen to take up homesteads in the forest reserves has been brought up during my remarks. The right is only one in form and not one in substance, and I will tell the Senator from Indiana why. The cattle and sheep men are a pretty stern, exacting lot of citizens. They are away off on the frontier and in the mountain fastnesses, and they are pretty nearly a law unto themselves in dealing with the ranges. They fought with the utmost determination the encroachment of the settlers upon the grazing lands of the plains. For years and years they were able to check the settlement of the plains by those who desired to take up lands under the homestead and other laws. The average peace-loving citizen does not want to take up his home in a section where he will be regarded with hostile eye by those who believe that the range is theirs and that the erection of every fence and the building of every home within the range area is an encroachment upon their vested rights.

Mr. President, you may grant the privilege to take up homesteads in the forest reserves, but I want to say to the Senate it will be the nifty men who will take advantage of the privilege. It is in fact the equivalent of putting a stop to homestead entries when the lands are placed within forest reserves and then leasing the forest reserves to the cattlemen and the sheepmen of the mountains and plains. It is in part for that reason that the Senators from the West raise so loud a cry against the administration of this forest-reserve system, and, without referring now to the proposed new grazing law, it is the equivalent of barring from settlement every forest reserve that is declared by the President, not in terms but in results, for, as I suggested before, the peace-loving settler will hesitate to enter within the limits of forest reserves when they are, under the license system, occupied by the cattle and sheep of the stock growers.

Mr. TILLMAN. He takes his life in his hands when he does it.

Mr. PATTERSON. They feel that way, whether they do or not. Therefore the men of the West—

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. PATTERSON. In one moment. Therefore, Mr. President, a very great many men of the West are uttering an earnest protest against the whole forest-reserve system. I do not mean the cattlemen who get the advantage of the system, but I mean those who are not cattlemen and who depend for the improvement of their worldly condition upon the settlement of the country and the use and occupancy of the land for other purposes than that of grazing. Now I yield to the Senator from Nevada.

Mr. NEWLANDS. I should like to ask the Senator from Colorado whether he is opposed to any system of forest reserves?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I am not opposed to a wise system of forest reserves.

Mr. NEWLANDS. The Senator is an experienced man in the West, and I should like to have his views regarding a proper system of forest reserves. We know, of course, that in almost every system there is some abuse connected with it. In my belief abuses of the forest-reserve system have been largely eliminated and are being gradually eliminated. I should like to have the Senator's views upon the subject of a proper reserve system.

Mr. PATTERSON. There are, I think, in the neighborhood of 15,000,000 acres in Colorado in the forest reserves. It is the same as taking 15,000,000 acres out of the State from settlement. Those 15,000,000 acres embrace hundreds of thousands of acres of good, tillable farm land.

Some system, Mr. President, that will exclude the farm lands and lands that are more valuable for other purposes than for timber from the operations of the forest-reserve laws might be safely adopted, and it would meet the approval of the people of the West. Then we want these little, petty prosecutions abandoned.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield further to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. PATTERSON. With pleasure.

Mr. NEWLANDS. Assuming, Mr. President, that we have a forest reserve such as the Senator has described, would he not deem it wise to have some control over the grazing within that forest reserve? As I understand it, the uncontrolled grazing in the forest reserves by cattle and sheep results in the destruction of all the young plants and trees. Besides that, the uncontrolled grazing results in constant conflict between the owners of the herds of cattle and the owners of the flocks of sheep. In view of that, does the Senator deem it wise to have no control? Does not some control necessarily involve some system of permits and the payment of certain fees that will result in paying the expenses of that control?

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, measurably the Senator from Nevada is right. In some things his deductions are not good. As I have said, I have no objection. Indeed, I would welcome a wise and efficient reserve administration. But, Mr. President, I would not turn this Government into an exacting landlord. I would not turn this Government into the absentee landlord of Ireland, who, when he can not get that which he demands from his tenant, will eject him and turn somebody else into his holdings, especially when the property over which the Government exercises control as landlord, except the bare, naked land itself that belongs to all the people, has been improved without costing the Government a dollar or without any Government agent lifting a finger to improve it.

The trouble about it all is, Mr. President, there is too much administration, too much zeal, too earnest a desire to collect money, too earnest a desire to show financial results.

I desire to speak about the salary of the head of this Bureau. My opinion is that skilled as he may be, learned as he may be, his administration of the forests has not been such as to commend him to the people of the country to the extent of raising his salary. I have no doubt but that the Department and the President are moving solely under the advice of Mr. Pinchot. He sets himself up to be the expert par excellence of forestry and the administration of the forest lands. He makes the recommendations, he visits conventions of cattle and sheep men and appeases them with his representations about the wonderful things to be done for them under the system.

I have no question but that most of the evil in the administration of the reserves is the result of overzealousness of the head of this Bureau, and that instead of increasing his salary and thereby encourage him to continue in the objectionable way he has been going, we should check him suddenly and effectively.

I believe, Mr. President, that it would be a wise act upon the part of Congress to say, by refusing to increase Mr. Pinchot's salary, "when you show you are worthy of commendation by a wise and conservative administration of these great interests under your control, then, and not until then, will you receive the Government's approval in the way of increasing the salary that you receive."

Mr. TILLMAN. Will the Senator answer me a question?

Mr. PATTERSON. I shall try to.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. PROCTOR. Perhaps the Senator from South Carolina has in mind what the Senator from Colorado said, that these foresters were appointed in Washington. They are all under the civil-service law, which requires that they shall be appointed, so far as possible, from the States and Territories where they serve. Anyone applying for appointment, applies to the Civil Service Commission, and is notified when and where there will be an examination.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, I discover that in the administration of the civil-service law those that are at the heads of Departments and bureaus get pretty nearly all those who have taken the civil-service examination that they want. I had occasion not long ago to make application for a young lady, who had taken the civil-service examination and was at the head of the list, and yet she waited and waited and waited, and she received no notice that her services were required. I wrote to the head of the Civil Service Bureau for an explanation, and I was told—I may not get it exactly, but some Senators who are familiar with the workings of civil service will correct me if I am wrong—that out of the first three, the Department could select anyone that it chose.

Mr. PROCTOR. That was right.

Mr. PATTERSON. And that after selecting one from the first three, then they went to the next three.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is the law.

Mr. PATTERSON. And that the two next to the first got the go-by.

Mr. PROCTOR. I will say that the two not selected still remain on the list for a certain time.

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, Mr. President, the Senator from Vermont must be mistaken. They do not remain.

Mr. PROCTOR. Oh, yes; they do.

Mr. PATTERSON. Oh, no. I am familiar with this case. I say "Oh, no," with great respect, of course, and only speaking of my knowledge of what the rule was in its operation upon the particular person I have in mind. She was not selected, although she was at the head of the list. I think it may be that they were permitted to take two out of three, and having taken two out of three, then they could go to the next two and skip the one that was left.

Mr. PROCTOR. The law, as I have it in mind—the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge] is more familiar with it—expressly provides that when one is taken from the first three the other two remain and are carried at the head of the list, another one being lifted. The one of the three that was not taken, but had been passed over a number of times—I think it was three times—is not further considered.

Mr. PATTERSON. Then this is the operation of it: Take the first group of three; out of that group they select one. The two of the three that are left, with the next one, form the next group; out of this they may take any one, and the two that are left compose, with the next, a group of three. They may take one of that group of three, leaving two for the next group,

and so on, and the person at the head of the list they take may never be selected.

Mr. TILLMAN. And after they have been certified three times they go dead.

Mr. PATTERSON. And after they have been passed over three times they go dead.

Mr. TILLMAN. What is the civil-service examination but a humbug?

Mr. PATTERSON. I am not here at this time for the purpose of discussing that.

Mr. TILLMAN. But you branched off on it.

Mr. PATTERSON. No; I was brought to it by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR]. I simply referred to it for the purpose of showing that those who are at the head of these bureaus can get pretty nearly whomsoever they please, and they can so manipulate the civil-service lists as to take those who are twenty or twenty-five from the head of the list and give them places in preference to those who, by their examinations, were at the head of the lists and were entitled to be and ought to have been taken first.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. PATTERSON. Certainly.

Mr. McCUMBER. I think, Mr. President, that I can show the Senator the difficulty. He will probably ascertain that there is some parent living here in the city of Washington whose ancestor at some time had spent a few days in Denver or some other place in Colorado, who possibly may have come to the city of Washington thirty years ago and have raised a family of children and grandchildren, and they are all of them going into the Government service as residents of the State of Colorado, although, as a matter of fact, none of them ever were or are to-day residents of that State.

The Senator understands as well as I do that anyone can claim his residence almost anywhere he sees fit. It is a question of intent. A parent or a grandparent who left the State of Michigan or the State of Iowa or the State of Colorado thirty years ago—himself and his whole family—are holding these positions, all claiming residence in the State from which the ancestor came. They are on the ground, and the moment there is a call for a position of this kind they understand where to go; they are alert; they get their examination and they are put in the service immediately, while the others will drop out at the end of the year and none of them can secure these positions. That is the beautiful working of this wonderful system of civil-service reform.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, naturally the Senator from North Dakota has more intimate knowledge of the workings of this system than I, a minority Senator, have. I learned during the first year of my term in Washington that no Democrat need apply. I recollect going to the head of a bureau to speak about some friend who I desired should receive a place. I wanted to know how it came that no Democratic Senator could receive an appointment. "Well now," the official said, "I will let you into the secret if my name is not to be given." I said "Certainly not." He said: "About 95 per cent of all officials are under the civil-service rules, and the other 5 per cent constitute a body so small in number that it is not sufficient to go around among the Republican Senators and Members. Therefore, if we were to give a Democrat an appointment it would be as good as being given a sentence of execution."

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from California?

Mr. PATTERSON. With pleasure.

Mr. PERKINS. I only want to say to my friend from Colorado that the Civil Service Commission, as at present constituted, is composed of a majority of Democrats. There is only one Republican on that Commission. Therefore, if they have not been just to the Senator, it is not the fault of the Republicans.

Mr. PATTERSON. Mr. President, the little incident I was giving had nothing to do with the Civil Service Commission, but it had to do with those positions that may be dispensed outside of the Civil Service Commission. But the Civil Service Commission only executes the law. Congress made the law and the Commission is not responsible for it.

Mr. President, I will occupy the time of the Senate but a few minutes longer. I simply wanted to give the reasons why it would be prudent at this time not to make the proposed increase of salaries.

And just one word more: We are engaged in increasing the salaries of what some of the other employees of the Govern-

ment denominate the "big bugs" of the Government—the President, the Vice-President, the Supreme Judges, Senators, Members of the House of Representatives, the Cabinet officers, and the heads of various bureaus, everybody with a high title, those who usually have a reasonable amount of this world's goods, have received a very substantial increase in salary, while the great mass of the employees of the Government are left where they were and where they have been for many years. I do not believe we ought to increase the salaries of the high officers in the civil department of the Government until we are ready to take up consideration of the entire question covering an increase for the privates as well as for the colonels, the brigadiers, and the majors-general in the civil departments, so that the gulf between the salaries that are paid shall not be so great, and that the mass of employees, who work as hard and are as devoted to the public service as are the high officials, though occupying humble places, shall receive such increase as the mass of the employees of the Government deserve.

I want to say, Mr. President, that there are men and women of mature years who render splendid and efficient service to the Government, who to-day live from hand to mouth, utterly unable to lay by a dollar for future emergencies in case of sickness or otherwise; and under the civil-service law and from the very necessities of their existence they will continue in the service until they are incapacitated by old age, and then, unless they have sons or daughters or charitable friends who will take them under their wing, they will be sent to the poorhouses or be forced to drag out a miserable existence upon the charity of others.

Let us put a stop, Mr. President, at this time to this increase in salary for the great officials of the Government. Let Congress, after proper investigation through its committees, determine what increases there should be, and then, in the increase made, let it be an increase all along the line.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, this proposition brings up to some extent the whole matter of the salary question; and while I do not intend in the five or ten minutes that I shall devote to this matter to go into that subject, I do want to call to the attention of this Senate some of the discrepancies that we are not only meeting in this bill, but that we are to meet in every one of our bills, which we are compelled to meet, and will be compelled to act upon before another session of Congress is closed. There is a genuine demand for an increase of salaries all along the line; and before another year this Senate and the House of Representatives will vote a general increase. The question, then, that will present itself to the Senate is whether or not this increase will be intelligently voted or whether we shall simply take up those cases that we think ought to have an increase, without any comprehensive view of the entire question.

We are starting again in a system which we have continued for twenty years of raising salaries by piecemeal, without reference to whether the particular salary raised is commensurate or proper when compared with other salaries that are being paid for like services in the Government employ.

Why, Mr. President, I take up this very bill which is presented to us, and there is not, I believe, one Senator out of a dozen who can give any good reason for the salary in one instance being fixed at one rate and in another at another rate. Let me call attention to this: In the bill which the committee has reported they raise the salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau to \$5,000.

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Senator will allow me, the salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau is not proposed to be raised by this bill. It is already \$5,000.

Mr. McCUMBER. I was going to correct that. The salary of the Chief of the Weather Bureau is \$5,000, while that of the Chief of the Bureau of Soils is \$3,500. I do not know, and I am very doubtful if the majority of the Senate know, why the Chief of the Weather Bureau should receive \$5,000 and the Chief of the Bureau of Soils should receive but \$3,500.

I take up the next. We have the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry, whose salary is to be increased to \$5,000, while the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics and that of the Director of the Experiment Stations is \$3,500 in each case. What is there in the work of the Chief of the Bureau of Animal Industry to put him above the Chief of the Bureau of Statistics or the Director of Experiment Stations? There may be reasons for it. I am not criticising it upon the ground, Mr. President, that there are not reasons, but upon the ground that we do not know the reasons, and therefore are scarcely competent to vote on it. I am admitting that the members of the particular committee may understand the reasons for the difference between the salaries of bureau chiefs as fixed here, some being \$3,500 and others \$5,000.

Let us take the next. The salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry is fixed at \$5,000 and that of the Chief of the Bureau of Biology at \$3,000. There is a spread again of \$2,000 between the salaries of those two chiefs. Why? Is not the character of the work practically the same? Does it not require the same scientific knowledge in the one as in the other? Is not the importance of the work to the Government about as great in the one case as it is in the other?

I take, then, the next—the Chief of the Bureau of Forestry. His salary is raised from \$3,500 to \$5,000. I go on down to the Chief of the Bureau of Accounts and Disbursements, whose salary is only \$2,750. I do not understand, Mr. President, why there should be this great spread between the salaries of the chiefs of these different bureaus. When I go to the next one I find that it is proposed to increase the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry from \$3,500 to \$5,000, while I find the salary of the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology is \$3,250. I do not know that the importance of the one to the Government is particularly greater than that of the other. I go now, Mr. President, beyond that to other salaries proposed by the legislative bill. I want to call attention to two or three—

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. McCUMBER. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. Before the Senator takes up the legislative bill—

Mr. McCUMBER. I will be very brief with it.

Mr. PROCTOR. I want to say to him that the reason for the salaries of some bureau chiefs being put at \$5,000 is because they are at the head of very much larger bureaus. If the Senator will look at the amount of the appropriation, he will see that it runs all the way from a million up to a million and a half dollars, while for some of the bureaus which he has cited the appropriation is less than \$100,000, and the number of employees and their duties and responsibilities are correspondingly less.

Mr. McCUMBER. One bureau may have a greater number of employees than another, but the scientific knowledge required and the services performed in a smaller bureau may be equally as great as in the larger bureau. But what I insist upon is, if one position requires equally responsible work, requires the same scientific knowledge, the same general intelligence and capacity as another, it should be practically paid the same.

Let us take the legislative bill. I find by that bill that the Assistant Secretaries receive \$4,500—that is, the Assistant Secretaries of State, of the Navy, of War, and so forth, receive only \$4,500. Mr. President, in some respects the President himself has but a little more responsibility than the Assistant Secretary of State. He does a great deal of the work of that great Department. We are required to pass upon his acts as much as upon the acts of any other officer. He is given the sum of \$4,500; and I find that the Doorkeeper of the House of Representatives is also paid \$4,500. So the Doorkeeper of the House and the Assistant Secretary of State both receive exactly the same salary.

If I take the case of the Public Printer, I find that he is receiving a salary of \$6,000, while the Chief of the Bureau of Manufactures, certainly as important a position and certainly requiring as much expert knowledge and intelligence, receives but \$4,000. I find that the general superintendent of the railway mail service, a very important position, is given but \$4,000, while the Director of Standards, whatever his services may be, receives a salary of \$5,000.

I for one, Mr. President, am wholly unable to see the reason for the head of an apparently less important office receiving more than the head of a more important one. There may be good, honest, and just reasons for it, but the whole trouble comes from the fact that we have followed, year in and year out, this system, until the great army of employees has grown so enormous that we are absolutely incapable of dealing with them individually. Not only are we incapacitated from considering the whole subject as it ought to be considered, fully and comprehensively, but no Senator or Representative, with his manifold duties, is capable of giving the requisite attention to that work.

To meet that very thing there has been introduced during this session, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations, a bill providing for the appointment of a nonpartisan commission, so that we may get as nearly exact justice as possible, whose duty it would be during the next six or seven months to go comprehensively into this whole subject, and to bring before the Senate and the House some data upon which we can act. I hope, Mr. President, that the committee will consider this or some similar

bill that will result in bringing before us the proper data upon which can be exercised the enlightened judgment of the Senate and the other House in fixing all these salaries.

Mr. President, I tried to get some of the information that is requisite to enable me to act intelligently in the determination of what any particular salary should be. I ask of the proper department, especially of the Civil Service Bureau, if they can tell me, of the clerks who are in the city of Washington, how many are men and how many are women? They do not know. Of the men, how many are married and how many are single? They do not know. Of the women, how many are married and how many are single? I am unable to get that information. In how many instances are both husband and wife employed in the Government service in the Departments here? I can get no information on the subject. In how many instances are there two or more members of the same family employed, giving the number employed in each family? No information is forthcoming upon that subject. Every one of these questions has a direct bearing upon what salaries should be fixed in these cases.

I want to know also how the salaries of the clerks of the Departments in the city of Washington compare with the salaries of clerks performing like services in other large cities in the United States. There is not a Department that can give me that information, not even the Keep Commission, which seems to have been appointed for that purpose. I want to know how the salaries compare with the salaries of clerks performing like services in the smaller cities and the rural districts of the country; but, Mr. President, I am unable to get any information upon that subject.

I interrupted the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PATTERSON] only a few moments ago upon the question that he was then discussing. We have here, Mr. President, a civil-service law and rule. That civil-service rule prescribes this one proposition, that every State in the Union shall have its proportionate share, according to its population, of all of the Federal positions in the United States. Is there any Senator who has the audacity to announce that this is carried out in spirit to any extent whatever? To the best of my knowledge—and I make the statement from my own inquiry—four-fifths of the entire clerical service in the city of Washington is performed by actual and bona fide residents of the city of Washington, whose ancestors or whose relatives at some time lived in this State or that State—in the State of Indiana or somewhere else—and their descendants are still claiming residence there, although their parents have been in business here for twenty or thirty or forty years, and every one of their children goes into the Government service. We have every morning and evening in the newspapers cartoons depicting the poor clerk that has to support a family in this city. If they were a correct picture of the real facts, there would be a great deal more in the demand for an immediate increase of salary than there really is. I am in favor—I am emphatically in favor—of the raising of all salaries below at least \$1,000 to what they should be. But here are the facts as they absolutely exist: Here is a man who has a family of two boys and three girls. He is in the civil service, drawing perhaps \$2,000 in Government employ; two or three daughters are drawing \$1,200 and above that, and the two sons are drawing \$1,800 and above that. That makes a pretty fair salary for one family.

I take into consideration another fact. The civil service was intended to give a square deal and an honest opportunity for every person in every State, to give a chance for the young men to secure positions and to secure the proper education connected with those positions, and the additional salary that is paid by the Government, because everyone of us knows that the Government pays a greater salary than is paid in any line of private business. Here the young men come as members of this family in the city of Washington, and they marry possibly somebody else in the service. Does either one of them go out? Not by any means. We continue the married woman and the married man in Government employ; we continue everyone of them in employment. They live together, but certainly are not conforming to the demand of the President of the United States for what he believes to be for the interest of this great Government in the way of an increase of population. [Laughter.] There are no additions to the family whatever. They still hold their Government positions and remain here, and other people are kept out of Government positions.

Mr. President, there is no fraud in the United States that will compare with the operation of the civil service of the United States.

Instead of there being an opportunity generally, as was designed by that law, the District of Columbia supplies practically all of the service that is required in the Department. That is no argument against the raising of a salary to an honest compen-

sation, but we ought to have that information and we ought to have a rule and a law that the moment any man holding a position in a Department marries a woman holding a position in a Department she should step out and give an opportunity for a man to earn a living for himself and his family. I should like to see the other rule applied also, that where a man or a poor girl desires a position to support an aged mother or a widow, or somebody dependent upon him or upon her, from the family of whom five or six are in office at least one member shall go out of the Government service that another person may have an opportunity to go in. That is the square deal which we ought to get in this whole civil-service matter, and that is the square deal which we are not getting and we never did get.

Mr. President, I sincerely hope Congress will take hold of this matter and investigate the question of salaries, appoint a commission or otherwise that can give it the proper consideration, and then let us at the next session of Congress revise the whole salary list from the President down to the day worker and get as near justice as we possibly can. That is the only method, in my opinion, under which we can secure anything like a correct basis for fixing salaries.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment reported by the committee.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PATTERSON. The Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE] stated that it was his purpose to call for a yea-and-nay vote on this question.

Mr. WARREN. Perhaps the Senator from Colorado did not hear the statement of the Senator from Maine. He withdrew his objection to the amendment, and said that in view of the modest salary which this gentleman receives he favored the adoption of the amendment.

Mr. PATTERSON. If it is not too late, I ask for a yea-and-nay vote on the amendment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair will regard the amendment as open.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming (when his name was called). I am paired with the Senator from Missouri [Mr. STONE]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

Mr. CULLOM (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN]. I transfer the pair to the junior Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. WETMORE], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. FLINT (when his name was called). I am paired with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON]. In his absence I withhold my vote.

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. TILLMAN. I have a general pair with the Senator from Vermont [Mr. DILLINGHAM]. I do not see him present in the Chamber, and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. FLINT. I transfer my pair with the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] to the junior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. DRYDEN], and will vote. I vote "yea."

Mr. WARREN. I wish to say in behalf of Senators who are on the Military Committee that a quorum of that committee is engaged upon an investigation authorized by this body. Otherwise they would be present to answer to their names.

The result was announced—yeas 47, nays 9, as follows:

YEAS—47.

Aldrich	Clay	Hopkins	Newlands
Allee	Crane	Kean	Perkins
Ankeny	Cullom	Kittredge	Piles
Bacon	Depew	Knox	Proctor
Beveridge	Dolliver	Latimer	Scott
Brandeggee	Dubois	Lodge	Simmons
Burkett	Flint	Long	Smith
Burnham	Gallinger	McCreary	Smoot
Burrows	Gamble	McCumber	Sutherland
Carter	Hale	Mallory	Warren
Clapp	Hansbrough	Money	Whyte
Clark, Mont.	Hemenway	Nelson	

NAYS—9.

Berry	Dick	McLaurin	Pettus
Curtis	Frazier	Patterson	Rayner
Daniel			

NOT VOTING—34.

Allison	Dryden	McEnery	Spooner
Bailey	Du Pont	Martin	Stone
Blackburn	Elkins	Millard	Tallaferro
Bulkeley	Foraker	Morgan	Teller
Carmack	Poster	Mulkey	Tillman
Clark, Wyo.	Frye	Nixon	Warner
Clarke, Ark.	Fulton	Overman	Wetmore
Culbertson	Heyburn	Penrose	
Dillingham	La Follette	Platt	

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. President, in the session of 1905 I opposed the transfer of the Bureau of Forestry to the Agri-

cultural Department. At that time I predicted that if the transfer was made we should enter upon an administration of extravagance. From the report made upon the bill, which was approved February 1, 1905, I desire to read a brief extract. The report was made by Mr. MONDELL, of the House.

It is believed—

He said—

that the transfer will result in increased economy and efficiency of administration and place all the forestry work of the Government on a practical basis.

I wish simply to call the attention of Congress to the fact that in 1905 the appropriation for the administration of this service was \$375,000, that being the largest sum that had ever been appropriated for this purpose. At that time the money received from the sales of timber and the money received for rentals of grazing lands was all covered into the Treasury of the United States. The bill which was approved February 1, 1905, provided that for a period of five years the sales of timber and the receipts from grazing lands should be covered into a fund and permanently appropriated, and the Secretary of Agriculture could check on this fund in administering the forest reserves. I find to my surprise that in the agricultural appropriation bill passed last year the limitation of five years on this fund was stricken out, by this language:

That the forest-reserve special fund provided for in section 5 of the act approved February 1, 1905, entitled "An act providing for the transfer of forest reserves from the Department of the Interior to the Department of Agriculture," shall continue until otherwise provided by law.

So, under the present law, all the money received from the sales of timber and all the money received for grazing rentals goes into a fund which the Secretary of Agriculture may use as he sees fit, without Congress being consulted. It is what they call in the Department "short-circuiting Congress." They speak of a peculiar way in which they can short-circuit Congress and expend the money of the Government without Congress ever being notified or consulted.

I am one Member of Congress who believes in publicity. I believe it should apply to the Departments of the Government just as thoroughly as it applies to any branch of private business, and I see no reason why funds belonging to the Government of the United States should be collected and expended by a Cabinet official or the head of a Department without Congress being consulted. The Members of the lower House have to go to the people every two years and account to them for the management of the Government affairs. The Members of the Senate go back every six years, and are held accountable. But here is a Department of the Government given complete power to sell millions of dollars' worth of timber, to take the receipts from grazing lands, and to expend the money under this short circuit which they have arranged, and Congress and the people of the United States are not permitted the privilege of knowing how the money had been expended, how much, or where, or when.

Mr. PROCTOR. I wish to ask the Senator from Indiana if he has looked at the whole of the section which he quoted in part? He will see that the concluding part of it provides:

But after June 30, 1908, it shall not be expended except in accordance with specific estimates of expenditures to be made from said fund for the succeeding fiscal year, to be submitted by the Secretary of Agriculture with the estimates of appropriation in the annual Book of Estimates.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then I can not understand why the language should be used here "shall continue until otherwise provided by law;" for section 5 of the act of February 1, 1905, reads as follows

Sec. 5. That all money received from the sale of any products or the use of any land or resources of said forest reserves shall be covered into the Treasury of the United States and for a period of five years from the passage of this act shall constitute a special fund available, until expended, as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, for the protection, administration, improvement, and extension of Federal forest reserves.

This provision strikes out, in effect, the five-year limit, and says it shall continue until otherwise provided by law.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. May I call the attention of the Senator from Indiana to page 42 of the pending bill, which strikes out the House provision that hereafter a detailed estimate of the service appropriated for shall be submitted to Congress? I wish the Senator would speak of that.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I am coming to that in just a little while.

Mr. PROCTOR. If the Senator will allow me, I acknowledge that it is peculiarly worded, and it is not my wording, but I would interpret it to mean that while it continues as a special

fund it can not be used except under an estimate and by an appropriation by Congress. That is the only way the two clauses can be reconciled.

Mr. HEMENWAY. After the year 1908?

Mr. PROCTOR. After the year 1908.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I can not understand why it should be delayed until 1908.

I wish to call attention to the fact that my prediction has proved more than true, much to my regret. While this item was carried upon the sundry civil appropriation bill, which is handled by the Committees on Appropriations of the House and the Senate, \$375,000 was the largest sum appropriated for this service, and at that time, as I have stated, the sales of timber and the receipts from grazing lands went into the Treasury of the United States. The agricultural appropriation act of last year increased this amount to \$1,000,000. From \$375,000 the sum went up to a million dollars, and in addition to that there was used from the money derived from sales of timber and from grazing lands some forty-odd thousand dollars.

Now, in this year's bill reported for our consideration the appropriation has been increased by asking for a million dollars, and that \$250,000 of that sum be immediately available.

Mr. President, I want to sound a little warning. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH] hands me a copy of the bill, which shows the total to be \$1,900,000. But I want to be absolutely fair. The recommendation of a million dollars was not carried in the last bill, but there is a recommendation in this bill of a million nine hundred thousand dollars, all told, asking that \$250,000 of that amount be made immediately available. I can not understand—

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. CARTER. The Senator stated that in addition to the appropriation of last year the sum of \$43,000 had been received for grazing permits.

Mr. HEMENWAY. That sum has been expended out of the funds received for grazing.

Mr. CARTER. The aggregate sum collected amounted to \$707,000.

Mr. HEMENWAY. But if there has been any of that expended other than \$42,000, I am not informed. There may have been more of the money expended, but as far as my information goes only \$42,000 of that sum has been expended.

I call attention to the fact that in addition to the sum on hand—some \$700,000, if the Senator from Montana is correct—an appropriation of \$1,900,000 in addition to that sum is now requested by the bill which we are now considering.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. HEMENWAY. Certainly.

Mr. HEYBURN. I only rose to say to the Senator from Indiana that upon request made last evening I received the exact figures of the amount on hand now. There was \$869,809.44 in this special reserve fund yesterday.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Then add to the \$1,900,000 the \$800,000 and over that is now on hand, and it makes an appropriation of \$2,700,000, in round figures, besides the receipts of this year, this appropriation being made for the fiscal year commencing July 1 next, when this sum will have largely increased. You have \$2,700,000, and with the receipts for the year commencing July 1 they would have on hand to expend in administering the forest reserves a sum no doubt running up beyond three and a half million dollars, as against a total expenditure of only \$375,000 for the fiscal year 1905.

Mr. CARTER. I beg the Senator's indulgence while I read from the address of Chief Forester Pinchot in a convention of foresters recently held in this city, in which this statement is made:

During the year of the transfer, in which we had charge of the reserves for five months only, the income was \$75,000, there being then no grazing fee. The next year the receipts were \$767,000, or during the past calendar year something over a million, and during the present fiscal year we shall take in about a million and a quarter.

So the \$1,900,000 specified in this appropriation is to be supplemented by this million and a quarter dollars to be collected from citizens of the country for temporary grazing.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Yes; and the \$800,000 on hand, as suggested.

Mr. President, I can not understand and I do not understand and no information is furnished by the Committee on Agriculture that would lead this body to understand the necessity for

this increase in the appropriation, running, as I say, from \$375,000 for the fiscal year 1905 to over \$3,500,000 for the fiscal year 1908.

We are now drifting rapidly into extravagant expenditures, and this Congress will mark the high-water line. I am told that when Congress adjourns we shall have appropriated over a billion dollars for this one session of Congress. We are entering upon a whole lot of duties that do not properly belong to the Government of the United States, and in this period of prosperity we are fastening upon the Government expenditures that are going to give trouble to us when we do not have so much prosperity, when our revenues are not so great as they are now. It means a deficiency next year, I am admonished by the Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE].

Mr. President, in view of the fact that I opposed this legislation at the time it was enacted, in view of the fact that I pointed out what, in my judgment, would follow, I felt it was my duty at this time to call the attention of the Senate, and as well the attention of the country, to this rapid increase in the expenditure of the Government's money. We are told that it means that great sums will come back to the Government. When this legislation was pending in the other branch of Congress, when I had the honor of being a Member of the other House, we were told that large sums of money were to be brought into the Treasury of the United States as the result of this policy. But we find that not only the money collected, but large sums out of the Treasury of the United States, are required to administer the Forest Service.

I had hoped that with an appropriation of from \$375,000 to \$500,000, and with the money received for grazing purposes and from sales of dead and down timber, even this department of the Government could administer the forest reserves. But I find instead they are using all the receipts from dead and down timber, all they receive for grazing purposes, and now are asking that \$1,900,000 in addition be appropriated out of the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. President, I do not believe that this appropriation ought to be granted. I do not believe that any fund should be placed in the hands of any Cabinet official or other official as a continuing appropriation. I believe that the Congress of the United States has a right to know at the beginning of each session of Congress, through the estimates furnished by the different Departments of the Government, the amount of money that they desire to spend for the ensuing fiscal year. I believe we have a right to know how it is to be expended. I believe we have a right to have reports through the estimates at the beginning of every session of Congress, that Senators and Members of the House may know what the money is to be used for.

I do not believe that the head of any Department of the Government is better qualified to direct the expenditure of the money of the Government than the Congress of the United States. The heads of Departments were not intended for that purpose. It is the duty of the Congress of the United States to regulate the expenditures of the Departments.

I had the honor, aided by the members of my committee, to suggest a provision of law which was enacted by the Congress of the United States, requiring that the Departments should stop making deficiencies and that they should confine themselves to the money appropriated by Congress. If Congress does not appropriate a sufficient sum of money, we are answerable to the people for it, not the head of the Department that has the money to expend. Under that provision we have in a way prevented the enormous deficiencies that they used to send down at the beginning of each session of Congress. We want publicity. We want it applied to the Departments of the Government. We want the people to know and Congress to know what the Departments do with the money of the Government; and there ought not to be a single dollar of Government money taken in that does not go directly into the Treasury of the United States and stay there until Congress, upon proper annual estimates, provides for its disbursement by the different Departments of the Government.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, I have listened to the statement of the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] as to the manner in which money should be appropriated for this particular purpose and the criticism which he has made as to the manner in which this fund is now being disbursed. I am in entire accord with the proposition that we should have an estimate made and sent to Congress before an appropriation is made for this purpose. But as far as the management of this fund is concerned, I desire to say that I understand that the Keep commission examined the accounts of the Forestry Bureau, and they state that this fund has not only been properly disbursed, but that the system of bookkeeping in the For-

estry Service is one of the best in use by the Government of the United States.

Mr. CARTER. Will the Senator—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. CARTER. Will the Senator advise us who constituted the Keep commission?

Mr. FLINT. I do not now remember the names of the commissioners.

Mr. ALDRICH. I was going to say that the Chief Forester was a member of the commission.

Mr. CARTER. I understand that the Chief Forester was a member of the board which examined these matters.

Mr. FLINT. I understand that one of the members of the commission, not the Forester, testified before the Littlefield commission a few days ago that the system of bookkeeping in the Forestry Bureau was perfect. As a matter of fact, an estimate of the expenses of the Bureau each year is made by the Forester and sent to the Secretary of Agriculture, and it is only proper and right that the same estimate should be sent to the Congress of the United States. There is no objection to that.

But as a matter of fact the expenses of the Bureau have not increased in proportion to the acreage that has been added to the reserves throughout the United States. An estimate was made by the Forester some years ago as to how long it would take before the reserves would be self-sustaining; and the reason why the expenses have increased was not that the reserves had been extravagantly managed, but there was more acreage, and by reason of the fact that there was a greater acreage there was a greater expense. The Congress of the United States is not asked to appropriate a dollar more than was estimated by the Forester when he made his estimate that in a certain number of years the reserves would be made self-sustaining.

I have a statement here which sets forth the amount which has been received from the various reserves and the amount of the estimated appropriation, and also the total amount of expenses and the total amount of receipts. This statement shows that in three years the appropriation that will be asked for will be \$400,000, and that will be the last appropriation that will be asked from the Congress of the United States.

Mr. LONG. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Kansas?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. LONG. In order that we may understand clearly the Senator's statement, do I understand that to be for the running expenses of the reserves? The Senator certainly does not wish to include the \$6,000,000 that the Forester asks of Congress to improve the reserve, one million of which is in this bill?

Mr. FLINT. I do not include that. I propose to answer the question propounded by the Senator from Kansas in a moment. There are two propositions that we have to meet in the management of the forest reserves. One is the general expenses of the reserves, the expenses in conducting the business, and to meet the expenses an appropriation was made for 1906 of \$875,000, for 1907 of \$1,000,000, and the estimate for 1908 of \$900,000, for 1909 of \$700,000, and for 1910 of \$400,000. During these years the expenses of managing the reserves increases each year by reason of the fact of the increased acreage, which requires additional expense by reason of the necessary supervision of this vast tract of land. The total resources of all kinds during these years, for 1906, was \$1,542,219.96; and is estimated, for 1907, \$2,250,000; for 1908, \$2,600,000; for 1909, \$3,100,000, and for 1910, \$3,400,000.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to inquire of the Senator from California if he can tell us for what purposes this sum of money, the million dollars that we are asked to appropriate, is to be expended?

Mr. FLINT. I will in just a moment.

Mr. HEYBURN. What is the class of expenditures?

Mr. FLINT. If the Senator will permit me to finish the statement, I will answer that question. While the expenses of the reserves have increased each year, the estimate is made by the Forester that in the year 1911 no appropriation will be asked for, and yet the receipts from all sources will be \$3,600,000 and the amount of expenses estimated will be \$3,500,000.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. HEYBURN. I should like to ask at this point, which is germane to the inquiry and necessary to give us a full enlightenment upon it, what is the character of the expense included within the appropriation asked of \$1,000,000? For what general purpose is it to be expended?

Mr. FLINT. For building roads, for building trails, for building fences and telephone lines, and other works of that kind in the forest reserves.

Mr. HEYBURN. Not including pay of rangers or foresters?

Mr. FLINT. No, sir.

Mr. HEYBURN. But for building roads, trails, and telephone lines, and that class of public improvements?

Mr. FLINT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEYBURN. For the private use of the forest reserve office?

Mr. FLINT. For the public use of the officers of the Government in conducting the business of the reserves.

Mr. HEYBURN. For the use of Government employees in conducting the business of the reserves?

Mr. FLINT. Yes, sir.

Mr. HEYBURN. Can the Senator tell us what business will be conducted that would authorize an expenditure of \$1,000,000 for roads, telephone lines, etc.?

Mr. FLINT. I can.

Mr. HEYBURN. What would be the business?

Mr. FLINT. If the Senator will permit me one minute, I desire to finish the part of my statement in reference to these expenses, and I will then devote my time to the million-dollar appropriation.

Mr. HEYBURN. I will be glad to have an explanation.

Mr. FULTON. Will the Senator allow me right there to make a suggestion?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. FULTON. I think many of these roads are necessary to enable the people to cross the reserves. I should like to have the Senator explain it, so that we shall understand it fully. I myself know that there is great necessity for roads, public highways, across these reserves; and if they are to be maintained as reserves under the control of the Government, the Government must certainly expect to construct roads.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. Right on the point to which the Senator is now addressing himself—that is, the increase of the expenditures with the decrease of appropriations—I understand the Senator that the necessary expense will gradually increase until it reaches something like \$3,500,000, but that the appropriations by Congress will decrease until they reach the minor point showing a profit in the operation of the reserves. I understand it further to be the fact that so far as grazing upon the reserves is concerned the Forestry Bureau estimates that that privilege is extended as far as it should be; in other words, that the reserves are now carrying all the stock they should carry.

Then, are we to assume that the increased revenue from which all the expenses are to be curtailed, \$1,000,000, is to come from the lumbering operations that are to be carried on, the sale of lumber, by the Forestry Division of the Government? I ask where the expenses are to come from rather than to be appropriated from the Treasury?

Mr. FLINT. I say the income from the forest reserves consists, first, of grazing, then the sale of dead and down timber, and standing timber, and for privileges that will be granted in the reserves.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. What privileges does the Senator refer to?

Mr. FLINT. Any privilege that is authorized by law.

Mr. CARTER. Does not the Senator understand that one of the privileges claimed under this bill is the right to charge the residents of the State for the use of the water power passing from a stream on the reserve?

Mr. FLINT. I do not.

Mr. CARTER. Is not that right now claimed for the Forestry Division?

Mr. FLINT. I do not so understand it.

Mr. CARTER. Is it not true that in a certain case in California, or possibly in Nevada or Arizona this side of the California line, the Forestry Bureau insist that they have a right to charge citizens of the country 75 cents per horsepower for permitting water from a stream to run through a wheel?

Mr. FLINT. In answer to the Senator from Montana I desire to say that I understand that the question whether the Forester has the legal right to charge for conserving the waters within the forest reserves and granting rights of way to operate the electric light and power plants therein has been submitted to the Attorney-General for his opinion, and until the Department renders a decision in that matter no action will be taken. In the event that the Attorney-General of the United States advises the Forester that he has the right to make a charge for the privileges granted, I presume that he will make a charge; but I desire to say that I am not in favor of any exorbitant charge being made. I favor a charge for these privileges that would be reasonable, a charge that would make the reserve self-sustaining.

Mr. CARTER. If the Senator will permit me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. CARTER. It is not the question of the amount of the charge, but the question of the right of any arm of the Federal Government to charge the citizens of a State for the use of the running water in the streams of a State.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, the proposition being discussed now is rather a startling one to me, and it has been repeated two or three times to-day. We are endeavoring to get a forest reserve in New Hampshire to conserve the waters of the State. We have a river in New Hampshire that carries more spindles than any river in the world. It did a few years ago, and I think it does now. Is it possible that the forest service can step in, if we establish a forest reserve, and compel our citizens who have manufacturing concerns to pay tribute to the Government.

Mr. HALE. On the Merrimac River?

Mr. GALLINGER. On the Merrimac River. I should like to know that, because if that be so, we want to abandon the proposition to have a forest reserve. We are not proposing to put our interests in the hands of the Government, so far as our manufacturing establishments are concerned. I should like to know exactly what has been done in that direction.

Mr. ALDRICH. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Rhode Island?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the Senator from California, subsequent to the suggestion made by the Senator from New Hampshire, if he sees any reason why communities should not be built up and developed and industries established in this great empire which has been set apart and belongs to the Government. I can not understand why this vast area which is larger than ten or twelve different States should be segregated from the rest of the country, and why it should not be developed and used and settled as other parts of the country are.

Mr. FLINT. I will answer the Senator from Rhode Island by saying that our experience in the West, or at least mine from my investigation, has been that the vast tract of lands in the mountains have not been taken by settlers, but they have been taken up and are now held in vast tracts, and it has resulted in an absolute monopoly of the timber business, and unless the forest-reserve system is carried on there will be an absolute control of the lumber business of the United States in the hands of a few lumber companies.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I should like to ask the Senator from California a question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming. I ask the Senator if that theory is not a complete abandonment of the original forest-reserve theory which we passed through a law, to wit, that the forest reserves should be at the headwaters of streams to prevent floods and hold back the water?

Mr. FLINT. I will endeavor to meet and discuss that question. I desire for a moment to turn to that part of the statement in reference to the expenses of the reserves.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. TILLMAN. I am entirely ignorant of the working of this forest-reserve system, but in traveling around the country

a little, as I have been doing lately, I was in Montana and near one of these forest reserves. Talking with the everyday people you meet in a hotel, who may or may not have known what they were saying or may or may not have been telling the truth, I got the impression (those Senators who live in that part of the world can tell me whether it is correct or not) that all the great lumber barons—the "lumber trust," as it is called, those having the large mills and whom the Senator alluded to a moment ago—would be apt to gobble up the entire forest area that was fit for lumber. I was told, as I said, that these men were now getting the privilege of cutting the timber in the forest reservations, and getting it at such a small sum that it was worth six to ten times what it was being sold for, and that the people had to pay the same price for lumber regardless of this supply and under that dispensation; and we were reserving these forests for the purpose of letting the lumber barons or the lumber trust enjoy the opportunity to just take it in as they needed it to add to their already overgrown fortunes.

Now, if that is true or if it is not true, I should like the Senators from that part of the country to tell us. We have no forest reservation in my part of the world. Somebody was talking about trying to get one in the Appalachian Mountains, down there, but if we are going to have the ills and the other accompaniments which we are guessing at from what we hear, I do not want any forest reserve in mine. I should like the Senator to tell me whether the story I heard in Montana is a myth or whether it has some foundation in fact.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, will the Senator from California kindly yield to me?

Mr. FLINT. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President, I have no doubt it is the honest intention of the forest-reserve management to give everybody an equal show in the purchase of the timber; but the fact is, the man running a small sawmill is outbid for this timber and driven out of business, whereas the large mill owner, having an equipment enabling him to reduce the logs to merchantable shape more cheaply, is enabled to bid a larger price for the stumpage. It thus comes to pass in the State of Montana that the price of lumber has gone up, because of no competition on the part of small sawmills, from an average of \$11 a thousand to an average of from \$17 to \$40 per thousand.

I have a letter on my desk from a ranchman in the upper part of the Bitter Root Valley announcing that the commonest kind of lumber in that country now costs \$17 a thousand, and they are surrounded by forests, by superb trees; that there is but one sawmill left of any consequence in that valley, and that belongs to one of the wealthiest corporations on the American Continent.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator from California will permit me, the forestry arrangement that we are now working under permits the timber supply which has been reserved for the people to go through the fingers and turn into the pockets of the millionaire lumber manufacturers, with all this forestry, just as they need it, while the people who want to buy lumber at a reasonable price can not get it.

Mr. CARTER. If the Senator will permit me—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield further to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. CARTER. Our people are in favor of forest reserves for the purpose of conserving the waters. They are in favor of forest reserves for the purpose of perpetuating the forests. But their objection rests in the extravagant and unreasonable proportions to which this Bureau has spread the forest scheme on a slender basis of law. We have a mighty mass of rules and regulations, many of them utterly indefensible and oppressive, which so far militate against the well-being of the country as to be well-nigh intolerant.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, answering the question of the Senator—

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. FLINT. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. Before the minds of the Senate get off from the points that have been raised I wish to say that I fully agree with the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] in regard to the propriety and the necessity of having all receipts of money go into the Treasury and have the expenses duly estimated for and the appropriation made by Congress. I have drawn an amendment that I think I showed to the Senator which fixes that matter for the future, and which is, I believe, satisfactory.

Now, with regard to the use of water—

Mr. ALDRICH. Will the Senator be kind enough to have the amendment read and printed, so that we may see the effect of it before it is finally acted on?

Mr. PROCTOR. I will read it now.

Mr. HALE. And have it printed.

Mr. PROCTOR. And I will then pass it up to be printed. In place of the proviso after the appropriation, I propose to insert:

Provided, That hereafter, on or before the 1st day of January in each year, the Secretary of Agriculture shall submit to Congress detailed estimates of all expenditures intended for this service for the next fiscal year and detailed reports of all expenditures under any appropriation for such service during the preceding fiscal year.

I will send the amendment to the Secretary's desk and ask to have it printed.

Furthermore, as to the use of water—

Mr. HALE. As to the amendment which the Senator has submitted—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Vermont yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. PROCTOR. Yes.

Mr. HALE. My attention was distracted for a moment while the Senator's amendment was being read, and I wish to ask does it provide that estimates shall be submitted for all expenditures, including the official force and employees? That ought to be included.

Mr. PROCTOR. Yes. If the amendment is not broad enough to cover that, I will change it.

Mr. LODGE. I think that ought to be inserted.

Mr. PROCTOR. I think the amendment says "all expenditures," which, I suppose, would cover everything of that kind.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Massachusetts will state his point of order.

Mr. LODGE. At what point in the proceedings did the Senator from California [Mr. FLINT] lose the floor?

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from California yielded to the Senator from Vermont, as the Chair understood.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, in regard to the use of water, I wish to say that no charge has ever been made, and it is not proposed to make any charge for the use of water. There was nothing in the law, as I understand, authorizing it; but it was proposed as a matter of negotiation where it was for the advantage of local interests to conserve the water, to make some arrangement by which a portion of the expenditure might be borne by those interested in it. It is, however, entirely a matter of negotiation, and nothing whatever was done under it.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FLINT. Yes.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Just a word, Mr. President. I want to ask if it would not be advisable to so amend this bill that the receipts from the sales of dead and down timber and for the rent of grazing lands should be covered into the Treasury, and then that appropriations be made from time to time as the committee sees proper; in other words, if we should not so amend the bill as to accomplish that result?

Mr. FULTON. Mr. President, I rise to a point of order.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon rises to a point of order, which he will state.

Mr. FULTON. I must submit that it is not in order during the course of the speech of the Senator from California to propose another amendment and to discuss it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the Senator from California had yielded.

Mr. HEMENWAY. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Oregon that my suggestion was with the full permission, as I understood, of the Senator from California. I have learned to believe that that Senator can take care of himself fairly well, whether in California or in the Senate of the United States; but if I am intruding on the Senator, I will not press my inquiry further.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Vermont?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. PROCTOR. In answer to the question of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY], I will say that I think the bill does now provide that all receipts shall be turned into the Treasury. If not, I am in favor of so doing, and trust it may be so changed. If it is lacking in that particular, I will ask that it may be corrected. I believe in that just as earnestly as the Senator from Indiana can.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, in answer to the question of the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN], I desire to say that if the timber in these reservations owned by the United States can not be controlled by the Congress of the United

States by proper legislation so that they will not aid the great lumber companies of this country, but will be operated in the interest of the people, then that is the fault of the Congress of the United States and not of the Forestry Bureau. In my opinion the management of the Forestry Service thus far has not resulted in benefit to the great lumber companies, but to the people; and it will continue so in the future. I believe that to-day if it were not for these reserves every stick of timber would be in the hands of the great lumber companies of the United States, and would not be owned by the Government of the United States as a protection to the people.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from New Hampshire?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. GALLINGER. The Senator has not answered the question which I propounded, and I want to put it in this form because I am seeking information: Will the Senator state what his opinion is as to whether or not, if we should establish forest reserves in the White Mountains of New Hampshire, this service could exact tribute from the mills along the Merrimac River?

Mr. FLINT. I will answer the Senator in this way: If, as a matter of fact, the Appalachian and the White Mountain forest reserves were created, no right that now exists could be disturbed; but by reason of the creation of that reserve, if the water power in those rivers were increased 50 per cent and other companies desired to go in there and obtain rights upon these reservations, the Government of the United States should charge not for the water, but for conserving the water.

Mr. GALLINGER. I can not imagine how the water could be greatly increased; it might be to a small extent. But if the new concerns are to pay tribute, I do not know any reason why existing concerns ought not; and it has been said here to-day that that is the policy of the Service, and that they do exact such tribute.

Mr. FLINT. As I understand it, no charge has yet been made.

Mr. TILMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FLINT. Yes.

Mr. TILMAN. My understanding of the Appalachian Forest Reserve project is this: That the timber now on the mountains, among which these rivers rise in North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia, already, so far as forests do such things, preserve the rainfall and hold it in the leaves in the woods. The object of a reserve is simply to preserve the forests as they are, not as to the matter of timber especially; though in time, of course, the logs and the trees that are there should be culled out and turned into lumber. Yet the preservation of the water would continue, by reason of its being woodland, instead of being cut down and left for the rains to fall and rush off in torrents. There is no increase of water power. The only object is to preserve and let the water flow gradually, rather than to have it all rush off at one time, and thus have a succession of droughts and floods.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. HALE. Right in line with this discussion, which is helping to educate certain people, and right in line with what the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. TILMAN] has said, I wish to say that I supposed when we established this feature of the forest reserves, it was, as the Senator from South Carolina indicates, simply to hold the water and to prevent its rushing off, and that it was to maintain the forest system, in order to hold the water, but that that was to be for the benefit of the citizens below, so that his supply of water for his industry would be more regular in its flow and that there would be more of it during any particular season. But it never entered into my mind that because of this conservation of the forest any power, governmental or otherwise, would take advantage of that and raise the question in any way of charging the citizen for water in the river below.

My idea was that the forest reserve was for the purpose of increasing the flow of water, distributing it more properly, and that the citizen below got the benefit of it. I do not understand how it is that this question has ever been raised. I would not be in favor of this conservation of the water of the forest being doled out, no matter what any Attorney-General decided, by the managers of the reserve to the citizen below. I do not like that question to be raised at all, and I do not think the Senator himself ought to raise it.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from California [Mr. FLINT] has the floor. Does he yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I never heard that question raised until to-day, and I do not think it has been the law or practice. If there has been anything of the kind, Congress ought to curb it, of course.

Mr. CARTER. Mr. President—

Mr. WARREN. One moment. I assume that in the case mentioned by the Senator from Montana it occurred because it was done under some peculiar circumstances as the Senator can understand, such, for instance, as the expenditure of money or labor to especially accommodate or benefit some person or community.

Mr. CARTER. I will say to the Senator from Wyoming that the claim is made that this conservation of water in the timber on the forest reserves constitutes such a benefaction to that community as to warrant the Government in charging for the use of the water as it runs down the stream.

Mr. WARREN. I never heard of that, and if the Senator from California will permit me a little further—I will only take a minute—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Wyoming?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. WARREN. The whole forestry question was opened up or initiated, if you please, not many years ago in the Interior Department because the forests were being rapidly devastated by fire. I state it as my opinion, after living nearly forty years in the Rocky Mountain country, that up to the time when the Government interposed with its care and supervision more than 90 per cent of the forest growth of the public domain in the arid and semiarid region was consumed by fire. I have seen it estimated that 97 per cent of the forests have been so consumed; but I do not think I ever saw it estimated by those who were conversant with the subject at less than 90 per cent. And this loss aggregated not only millions, but scores, yes hundreds of millions of dollars. Now, there were large areas in the forest-reserve project of the Interior Department, to take care of which they at first commenced with a few men at \$50 or \$60 a month each for a man with a horse. It was found that the fires got away from them; that they could not be controlled. The men and horses were too few, too poorly paid, and scattered over too wide an area. It then occurred to the Department to put in cabins and improvements, so that more men could be employed, and better men, because of better inducements. So that in addition to sentinels, reserve men could remain in certain localities and be distributed around the forest reserve. They also put in telephone lines, which contributed much to the purpose and success. After this experimental stage it was plainly proven that with the building of roads and bridges, cutting trails, building cabins or dugouts, telephone lines, etc., and with proper care in the burning of brush and refuse ravages by fire could be prevented and a thousand times the cost of prevention could be saved.

Of course, the timber in these forest reserves on the public domain was there, first, for the use of the settler, and second, for the use of the mills, railroads, and commercial industries of the surrounding country. It seemed better to have somebody control it all and sell the down timber and grown timber, which was of no further use as a growing product, and protect and foster the growing green timber.

We may have gone along too fast or we may have been too slow; and we may be too extravagant now or we may have been too economical heretofore; but I will submit that in the first instance the matter of forest reserves was outside and apart from the matter of the conservation of the water. However, the latter soon followed, as it was a consideration vital to an irrigated or irrigable country, but outside of the water question we were rapidly losing the forests by fire. For that matter, the Indian who went hunting to shoot deer set fire to the forests to drive the game out. So did the white man. I have seen those fires, and other Senators present have seen them. Sometimes they were started by the Indians and by the white men to make trouble. And all of this was the inception of this forestry enterprise on the part of the Government. States and Territories could not do it; they did not own the lands nor did they have the money.

Now, at the present time it seems that we have two funds. We have a fund that is taken from the sale of the timber and a fund from the grazing permits. We have passed a law by which 10 per cent of the fund received from forest earnings shall go for roads to each county in which it is earned, the balance to be expended for administration and betterments.

Then we have another fund by direct appropriation from the Treasury for permanent improvements.

I want to say that my understanding is—if the Senator from California will permit me further—that the million dollars proposed to be appropriated in this bill, or whatever sum we shall provide, is for permanent improvements, such as cabins, roads, bridges, reservoirs, trails, telephones, etc., the roads being open to the public generally, and the telephones, so far as they have been put in, being such that they can be reached by the community at large, all this chiefly to place the whole forestry system under control against fire.

If the Department is taking too high a price for the lumber or for grazing, let us treat that subject on its merits. If a million dollars is too much to appropriate in one year, let us appropriate less; but let us not attack the matter of forest reserves proper and say we shall not protect them against these great fires and against carelessness in cutting out growing timber. Let us protect them fully. I do not think anyone believes we ought to bar all the cattle and all the sheep out of these bare parks inclosed by forests—and that is about all they really offer for grazing. We ought to permit grazing on the park-like areas within the limits of the reserves. But I will not encroach longer on the time of the Senator from California. I thank him very much for his forbearance.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, I simply desire to say that the estimates made by the Department show that the forest reserves will be self-sustaining.

Objection is made on the one hand to the manner in which this fund is being accumulated for the purpose of meeting the expenses of the reservations, and on the other hand objection is made to appropriating the necessary money for their maintenance. I am convinced that the Forestry Service has had an economical and honest administration, and the only question that arises is as to whether or not the Congress of the United States desire these reservations to be self-sustaining or whether Congress desire to appropriate money for their maintenance.

Mr. Pinchot has furnished me a statement, which I will ask to have printed in the RECORD. It contains the estimated expenses and receipts of the Forest Service from 1907 to 1917.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BULKELEY in the chair). In the absence of objection, the statement referred to by the Senator from California will be printed in the RECORD.

The statement referred to is as follows:

TABLE A.—FOREST SERVICE.

Estimate of receipts and administrative expenditures 1907 to 1917.

Fiscal year.	Receipts from forest reserves.		Total receipts from reserves.	Total from appropriations.	Total from all sources.
	Timber sales.	Grazing.			
1906.....	\$252,527.09	\$514,052.87	\$767,219.96	\$875,000.00	\$1,542,219.96
1907.....	550,000.00	700,000.00	1,250,000.00	1,000,000.00	2,250,000.00
1908.....	900,000.00	800,000.00	1,700,000.00	900,000.00	2,600,000.00
1909.....	1,500,000.00	900,000.00	2,400,000.00	700,000.00	3,100,000.00
1910.....	2,030,000.00	1,000,000.00	3,030,000.00	400,000.00	3,430,000.00
1911.....	2,530,000.00	1,100,000.00	3,630,000.00	3,630,000.00
1912.....	2,800,000.00	1,200,000.00	4,000,000.00	4,000,000.00
1913.....	3,100,000.00	1,300,000.00	4,400,000.00	4,400,000.00
1914.....	3,400,000.00	1,400,000.00	4,800,000.00	4,800,000.00
1915.....	3,700,000.00	1,500,000.00	5,200,000.00	5,200,000.00
1916.....	4,100,000.00	1,500,000.00	5,600,000.00	5,600,000.00
1917.....	4,500,000.00	1,500,000.00	6,000,000.00	6,000,000.00

Fiscal year.	Administrative expenditures.		
	Paid from receipts.	Paid from appropriation.	Total.
1906.....	\$319,143.87	\$875,110.00	\$1,194,253.87
1907.....	1,900,000.00	1,000,000.00	2,900,000.00
1908.....	1,000,000.00	900,000.00	1,900,000.00
1909.....	2,200,000.00	700,000.00	2,900,000.00
1910.....	2,800,000.00	400,000.00	3,200,000.00
1911.....	3,500,000.00	3,500,000.00
1912.....	3,800,000.00	3,800,000.00
1913.....	4,100,000.00	4,100,000.00
1914.....	4,300,000.00	4,300,000.00
1915.....	4,500,000.00	4,500,000.00
1916.....	4,700,000.00	4,700,000.00
1917.....	4,900,000.00	4,900,000.00

NOTE.—Receipts from privilege permits, being in their infancy and uncertain, are not included in above table, although they will probably total enough in themselves to repay a \$5,000,000 loan by 1917.

Mr. FLINT. The question is asked why should we appropriate \$1,000,000 at this time for permanent improvements?

Mr. HALE. Let me ask the Senator right there—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. FLINT. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I do not want to intrude upon the time of the Senator from California, but does the Senator think that in the scope of the original forestry reserve proposition for the conservation of the forests the question of their being self-sustaining entered at all into the consideration of their establishment? I did not so understand. I understood that it was a great project—to keep these forest tracts for the purpose of holding water, to make, as I said before—and I do not wish to repeat—to make it more equal in its flow and distribution. I did not understand that the Government, into whose hands we put this, was to go into any form of business upon these reservations, and the question of whether they were self-sustaining did not enter into my mind in the slightest degree.

Mr. FLINT. Does the Senator believe that forest reservations should be maintained at the expense of the Government of the United States?

Mr. HALE. Undoubtedly, Mr. President. If the great beneficent object which we had in view is to be so great as all nature, and all the operations of nature show to every man it will be, the forest reservations should be kept up if they do cost the Government. The moment that you introduce the feature of making them profitable, then you extend the reservation over tracts and areas that are not forests where it never ought to have been extended, and you depart from the original project upon which we embarked. They were not established for business and revenue, but for benevolent and beneficent purposes, and the forest reservations ought to have been kept in that way, devoted to that, and nothing else. We have departed from that and have made it a great business enterprise, in which the Government is engaged, and the question of profit to the Government has usurped the place of what was originally intended should be a great project of benevolence and beneficence in order to hold back and conserve the waters.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, in connection with that, I desire—

Mr. HEYBURN. Will the Senator permit me to give some figures in connection with that statement?

Mr. FLINT. I want to finish to-night.

Mr. HEYBURN. If the Senator will yield, I will say the interruption is for a useful purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from California declines to yield.

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to say that on Saturday Mr. Pinchot, the Chief Forester, under oath, before a responsible body stated that not less than 30,000,000 acres of land in the forest reserves do not at the present time contain merchantable timber. In other words, there is not less than 30,000,000 acres of nontimber land in forest reservations.

Mr. McCUMBER. Out of how many?

Mr. HEYBURN. Out of 121,000,000 acres.

Mr. FLINT. In answer to the statement as to land being included in the forest reserves that is not timber land, I desire to say that there is no question but that there are lands within forest reserves that are not now timber lands. But they are included in the reserves for two reasons. First, they are a part of a watershed and help conserve the water; and, second, they are lands which in time will be replanted and reforested. That seems to me a part of the original plan, that we should not only have the lands reserved that would conserve the waters, but, in addition, we should reserve the lands that will grow trees as, although they may not now be covered with timber, they should be replanted so that they will in time become great forests.

Mr. HALE. Now, I see—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FLINT. Yes.

Mr. HALE. I see the force of that. I see that where in a great forest reserve of so many thousand acres there is in the midst of it a tract which is not forest, but is comparatively bare—I see the force of the Senator's suggestion, that that should so be treated that in time it would merge with the other and become a forest reserve and help to conserve the waters. But, Mr. President, it is as far as the East is from the West that you substitute for that that the Government shall go into the grazing business on these areas which are not forests, and grazing on which through all time will prevent their ever being forests. We never contemplated that, and that never should have been embodied in this scheme of forestry reserve.

Mr. FLINT. Mr. President, I do not know whether the Senator from Maine alludes to the grazing privileges on the public lands now or the grazing permits on the forest reserves, but so far as the grazing permits on the forest reserves are concerned it must naturally follow that in these great reserves there must be land that is suitable for grazing, and it would be a mistake

if that land was not used for that purpose and the stock permitted to go upon the reserves.

Mr. HALE. But I understood the Senator to say—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield further to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FLINT. Yes.

Mr. HALE. I understood the Senator to say that the plan of treating these tracts which are not forests now was so that they would in the end become forests and would merge with the forests. We never will get that done if the Government goes into the grazing performance. You will never have anything there that will become forests. I object to the Government going into the grazing business on these tracts which are not now and if the Government continues to pasture them and graze them will never become forest lands.

Mr. FLINT. I am not in favor of permitting pasturing on forest reservations so that it will injure the land and prevent its being planted for the purpose of reforestation.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President—

Mr. FLINT. I decline to yield. I desire to conclude to-night.

Mr. HEYBURN. Of course it is the privilege of the Senator to decline to yield—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from California declines to yield.

Mr. HEYBURN. But if he is going to do it I want to know it.

Mr. FLINT. I want to finish. That is all.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask only an ordinary courtesy.

Mr. FLINT. I will grant it. Proceed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Senator from California yields to the Senator from Idaho.

Mr. HEYBURN. I rose for the purpose of putting into the Record some figures which are pertinent to the question immediately under consideration. I do not intend to tax the patience of the Senator from California by asking to interrupt him any more than is customary in the procedure of this body, and whenever the Senator from California desires to make an exception in my case he has only to indicate it, and I will not interrupt him further.

The Senator from Maine inquired as to the use that was made of these forest reserves for pasturage. I happen to have before me the testimony, under oath, of Mr. Pinchot, the Chief Forester, taken on Saturday before a committee of Congress, and he states:

That at least three-fourths of the whole area—

That is, the whole area of forest reserves—

is more or less used for grazing. Most of the western forests, you understand, are sparse, and the trees standing far apart, much sunlight reaches the ground, and there is a heavy growth of various kinds under the trees.

I desire also to give the figures, if it will not tax the patience of the Senator unduly, as to the extent of the grazing. He was inquired of as to the number and character of the stock grazed upon forest reserves, and he said:

We had last summer about 1,250,000 head of cattle and horses and about 6,000,000 sheep and goats on the forest reserves.

He was asked:

About how many would that be per acre?

Mr. Pinchot. If there should be 7,250,000 head altogether, divided into 100,000,000 acres, it would be one animal to 15 acres.

Those are facts which I thought it important to have considered in connection with the discussion of this question.

Mr. PROCTOR. Will the Senator from California allow me to say a word partly in reply to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FLINT. Certainly.

Mr. PROCTOR. It seems to me where the ground is covered with full-sized, comparatively open forests there can be no great objection to some grazing upon it.

Another thing, in regard to restocking; I had the honor once to serve as a member of a forestry commission in my own State, and I gave considerable attention to that. There are some trees which are not cropped very much, if at all, by stock. It depends upon the nature of the trees. Stock do not take to every kind of a tree. Pine and oak are not cropped very much, I think. I suppose that is a question which an experienced forester understands and ought to guard against. There ought to be no grazing that would interfere with the growth of the forest.

Mr. HALE. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Maine?

Mr. FLINT. Certainly.

Mr. HALE. I know something about lumber lands in Maine. I was struck with the testimony of the Chief Forester in favor of grazing, that large tracts of these reserve lands are covered

with a thick green growth underneath. Now, instead of that thick green growth being removed and destroyed by pasturing and by grazing, that is the very kind of growth which ought to be encouraged, because it is that which helps to hold the water. We found that out in Maine. The more undergrowth there is the better the supply of water that is retained in the forests for the benefit of the streams below, and instead of that being pastured on and nibbled and grazed off it ought to be kept in order to hold the water supply.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator should not forget to say that the packing of the earth by the animals destroys the water-holding qualities.

Mr. FLINT. I am not prepared to answer the question propounded by the Senator from Maine and answered by the Senator from Vermont. It is a practical question, and I take it for granted that a man like Mr. Pinchot, who has devoted his life to this work, who has not only studied the question in Maine, but in other States throughout the whole country, understands whether this particular reserve or that particular reserve should be pastured. I know that in my own State, in the southern part of the State, great harm would result to the reservation by pasturing sheep. In the northern part of the State, where there is plenty of rain, the result is different. There no harm could come, but benefit, by permitting the sheep to be pastured in the reserves.

Mr. HALE. What would be the benefit?

Mr. FLINT. The benefit, I would say, principally would result in eating up all the grass which, when it became dry, might catch fire in summer time and result in great forest fires.

We are making an appropriation this year of \$900,000 for expenses, and that, with the amount of the receipts from the reserves, will be sufficient to manage and operate them. The question is now presented whether or not the Congress desires to appropriate \$1,000,000 for permanent improvements. The Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] stated a moment ago the great loss to the reserves by reason of fires. We know from a study of this question that the reason why the fires have resulted in such great destruction is that because of the lack of proper roads, or trails, etc., they have not been able to have the forest rangers reach the fires in time to put them out, and that they had no means of communication with other rangers, so that they could all be brought to the place where the fire started.

This \$1,000,000 is asked so that the Forester can construct telephone lines, build houses for the rangers, and build trails throughout the mountains; so that they can travel from one part of the range to the other, build wagon roads; so that the lumber can be brought from the reserves and placed upon the market, and in addition to that give the public access through these reserves. I believe that if a prudent business man owned these reserves he would expend a sufficient amount of money to protect them from fire, and if we do not make this appropriation in the end there will be sufficient money from these receipts to do the work as planned. Mr. Pinchot believes that the income, as he estimates it, will permit him to build these trails, these roads and telephone lines. But in the meantime thousands of acres of timber and millions of dollars of property may be destroyed by fire. The question is, will the Congress of the United States make an appropriation now, so as to allow the Forester to proceed with this work, which is simply a matter of protection to the Government's property?

Mr. CLAY. Mr. President—

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Georgia?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. CLAY. I desire to call the Senator's attention to the very feature he is now discussing. On page 41, lines 23 and 24, as the Senator has stated, it reads:

Total for salaries and general expenses, Forest Service, \$900,000.

On page 42, which the Senator was discussing, the House gave an item of \$500,000, "to be expended as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, for proper and economical administration, protection, and development of the national forests." I want to say this to the Senator—

Mr. TILLMAN. That has been increased to a million.

Mr. CLAY. It has been increased by the Senate committee to a million dollars.

Mr. FLINT. Yes, sir.

Mr. CLAY. This amendment provides for the appropriation of \$1,000,000 to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to protect the forests, and there is not any estimate made of how it shall be expended. Does not the Senator think that in order to justify an appropriation of a million dollars for that purpose the Secretary of Agriculture ought to send to Congress an itemized statement as to how the money is to be expended? Is it not

going a long ways when we appropriate \$1,000,000 for him to use in his discretion, as he sees fit and proper, to employ any number of persons he may desire to employ, and to fix their salaries? I see the Senate committee has stricken out the words:

That hereafter a detailed estimate of the services herein appropriated for shall be submitted to Congress with the other estimates for the Department of Agriculture.

Is it not true that at every session of Congress there ought to be estimates sent to Congress showing how much it will take for these expenditures and what kind and classes of expenditures will be made? Simply to leave the Secretary to say how a million dollars shall be expended is, to say the least of it, giving him a power that he ought not to enjoy.

Mr. FLINT. I stated in the commencement that I was in favor of that and thought that was the proper procedure, and I understand an amendment has been agreed upon which provides that that shall be done hereafter.

Mr. CLAY. I was not aware of that.

Mr. FLINT. I believe the million dollars should be appropriated upon an estimate made to the Congress of the United States, and, in my opinion, all money for every Department should be appropriated only after an estimate has been made to the Congress of the United States.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I wish to ask the Senator a question.

Mr. FLINT. Only a word, and I shall be through.

Mr. HEMENWAY. I should like to ask a question as to the million-dollar appropriations.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. FLINT. I do.

Mr. HEMENWAY. If this appropriation of a million dollars is made, I ask if it will not commit the Government to the scheme to the extent of six or seven million dollars? I see it is stated that the improvements desired to be made will cost some six or seven million dollars, and this one million would only be the first appropriation, and it would commit the Government to the expenditure of the other six or seven millions.

Mr. FLINT. I do not think it commits us to any policy. There is no necessity for appropriating this million dollars to carry out any plan other than the same work that would be ultimately carried out by the Forester. The appropriation of a million dollars simply permits the Forester to do the work now, whereas otherwise it would be postponed some five or six or seven or perhaps ten years—the very work that the Forester would carry out now with this appropriation, provided he is permitted to continue the management and control of the reserves as he is now doing.

Mr. TILLMAN. Mr. President—

Mr. FLINT. I will close in a minute, if the Senator from South Carolina will permit me.

Mr. TILLMAN. I will let the Senator get through, but before he sits down I should like to ask him a question.

Mr. FLINT. I simply want to say one or two words in reference to the frauds which have been perpetrated by the creation of these forest reserves.

No one realizes more than I do the truth of the statement made by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. FULTON] that great frauds have been perpetrated by the creation of these forest reserves and the acquisition of lands by forest reserve scrip, but if these forest reserves had not been created the frauds in the homestead laws and the timber and stone act would have wiped out the forests and we would not have any timber land.

While the result of creating the reserves permitted a great many to obtain timber lands, at the same time the timber and stone act permitted them to take them also. The result of all the land laws has been that the West has been robbed of its rights. I believe that more than 50 per cent of the timber lands in the West have been directly or indirectly fraudulently acquired, and if our forest reserves did not exist and the land been thrown open under the land laws as they now exist, in a few years every foot of timber land in this country would be in the hands of large operators and the people of the United States would be helpless so far as concerns the charges that the owners of the timber could make for lumber. The only protection that we now have is to retain these lands and keep some timber in the possession of the people of the United States.

Mr. TILLMAN. Before the Senator takes his seat I should like to ask him a question.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from California yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. FLINT. Certainly.

Mr. TILLMAN. The Senator has just argued—and I agree with him entirely—as to the necessity and value of preserving

the forests, and he says that if we had not inaugurated the scheme of forest reservations all these lands would now be in the hands of large lumber barons, we will call them. What does the Senator consider the value of the timber on the forest reservations to-day?

Mr. FLINT. I have the statement here—\$660,000,000.

Mr. TILLMAN. That is Mr. Pinchot's estimate?

Mr. FLINT. Yes, sir. And then \$110,000,000. That would be \$770,000,000.

Mr. HALE. That is the timber on the reservations?

Mr. FLINT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILLMAN. Does that mean all the timber, or that which is to-day merchantable?

Mr. FLINT. That is the present value of it.

Mr. TILLMAN. Of the merchantable timber?

What I wish the Senator to consider and give us any information he has on it, for he has studied this question very thoroughly, is this: These reservations are intended to preserve that timber for the benefit of the people of the United States.

Mr. FLINT. Yes, sir.

Mr. TILLMAN. A capital of seven hundred and odd million dollars, with the income that would be derived from it in marketing that timber which is ready to be cut and sawed, ought to yield not only enough to administer it, but a very large income in addition, to go into the Treasury of the United States. Have you studied—I have read just a little on the subject—anything about the forest reserves in Germany and other European countries, where the governments have found it necessary to set apart certain areas of wooded land and to preserve those inviolable and to replant a tree for every one cut? They are protected and guarded, and the timber, as soon as it ripens, is sold to somebody who wants to turn it into lumber, and the governments derive large revenues from their forest reservations.

Now, in a barren country such as the West is, in a way, as far as water goes, with the preservation of the water supply for irrigation purposes involved in these reservations, there ought also to be held in view the preservation of the timber for the use of the country as lumber. Now, here are two interests to be served. Agreeing that a proper forest policy would be a wise and statesmanlike act on the part of Congress, does not the Senator see that with the immense amount of land covered by these trees, which are in a condition to be turned into lumber, we ought to derive a much greater revenue than the simple expense account of preserving them? In other words, if this timber is to be preserved and in the end is to be dribbled out to favorites who will buy it under conditions where there is not proper competition, will we not be preserving the timber for the benefit of those who will sell it at an enormous profit to other people later on rather than have it go into the market in such a way and under such conditions as will be to the best interests of those who want to buy lumber as well as to the best interests of those who want to preserve the water?

I ask the Senator this question because I know he will agree with me in the main, and I want him to give us the information which he has, if he has it handy, as to how long it will be before, if Mr. Pinchot is allowed to go on in his scheme, these forests will not only be self-sustaining, and not only will we not have to appropriate from the Treasury a sum commensurate with the expenses, but we will derive from these forests a large income to go into the Treasury, and at the same time there will be a continual reproduction of trees to supply those which are cut annually, like they do in Europe, and the forest policy of the Government will yield an income to the country, preserve the trees for lumber, preserve the wood for water supply for irrigation, and we will have a benevolent and proper administration. How long will it be before we reach that?

Mr. FLINT. I think the forest reserves in five years will be self-sustaining. I furnish a statement, which will go in the Record, which shows year by year up to 1917 what the profits will be from the reserves. I have not the figures so that I can give them, but they will appear in the Record.

Mr. TILLMAN. If the Senator can assure us from his study of this question and from his knowledge of conditions in the West that that is the policy which we are called on to appropriate for, and that in a very short time we will have an income from such forests, and that the lumber supply will not be gobbled up by the lumber trust, and that the trees will be there to supply the lumber for the country for all time to come, and that the trees will be there to supply water for irrigation for all time to come, I can see some sense in it; otherwise I do not see a bit.

Mr. FLINT. The Senator has stated it correctly, and much more clearly than I could state it. The maintenance of these reserves will not only assure a permanent water flow for the

arid districts, so that many acres can be irrigated, but it will make certain a supply of timber for the future.

Mr. TILLMAN. Then the Senator ought not to forget, and those in charge of these interests ought not to forget, the point made by the Senator from Maine, to the effect that grazing on these lands destroys all possibility of their being reforested, because anyone who is acquainted with timber growth knows that the nibbling of the buds of the young trees just come up destroys all possibility of their growing, and you can never get trees to grow on land after it has once been packed by the hoofs of cattle and sheep and the young growth destroyed as fast as it comes up. We have got to let the trees grow according to nature and try to keep the fires down, or else we will never have forests.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from California a moment ago to say that the timber on the forest reserves is estimated to be worth \$700,000,000. Am I correct?

Mr. FLINT. Seven hundred and seven million dollars.

Mr. GALLINGER. I have a letter from Mr. Pinchot under date of April 27, 1906, in which he estimates the value of all the forest reservations, 103,000,000 acres, at \$300,000,000, and that includes the timber. I simply want the Senator from California to look up the statistics in order to get it right.

Mr. FLINT. I have the statement of the present capitalized value of the forest reserves, which I ask to have printed.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the statement will be printed in the Record without reading.

The statement referred to is as follows:

PRESENT CAPITALIZED VALUE OF THE FOREST RESERVES (127,078,658 ACRES, NOVEMBER 27, 1906).	
1. Stumpage value of 330,000,000 feet of timber, at \$2 per M	\$660,000,000
2. 110,000,000 acres, capable of producing commercial forest, at \$1 per acre	110,000,000
3. 110,000,000 acres of range for grazing live stock, at 1½ cents per acre (capitalized at 5 per cent)	30,000,000
4. 83,000,000 acre-feet of water for irrigation purposes, at 10 cents per acre-foot (capitalized at 5 per cent)	166,000,000
5. 3,000,000 horsepower, capable of being developed from water in reserves, at \$10 per horsepower (capitalized at 5 per cent)	600,000,000
6. Estimated value of occupancy and use of reserve land, products, and resources additional to the above	5,000,000
7. Permanent improvements now on the reserves (roads, trails, cabins, telephones, etc.)	5,000,000
Total	1,576,000,000
Less 10 per cent for private holdings	157,600,000
	1,418,400,000

Mr. GALLINGER. I desire to offer an amendment to follow the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] a little time ago. I ask to have it read and printed that Senators may see it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment submitted by the Senator from New Hampshire to the amendment submitted by the Senator from Vermont will be read.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add to the amendment of the Senator from Vermont [Mr. PROCTOR] the following proviso:

Provided further, That the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby expressly prohibited from making any charge whatsoever for the use of water in the streams running through or any part of which is contiguous to any forest reserve.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. PROCTOR. Mr. President, with characteristic modesty I wish to suggest that we have merely progressed, in five hours, two lines in the bill, and that we are discussing matters five pages ahead of the point that has been reached in the reading. I can see no stumbling blocks until we reach page 41, where we have been discussing the matter of this appropriation. I suggest that it would forward matters to proceed with the reading and when we reach the point we have been discussing I will then be ready to yield for more discussion on it or for an adjournment.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will resume the reading of the bill.

The reading of the bill was resumed at page 38, line 6. The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 38, line 7, to increase the total appropriation for salaries, Forest Service, from \$141,700 to \$143,200.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 39, after line 2, to strike out:

That 10 per cent of all money received from each national forest during any fiscal year shall be paid at the end thereof by the Secretary of the Treasury to the State or Territory in which said national forest is situated, to be expended as the State or Territorial legislature may prescribe for the benefit of the public schools and public roads of the

county or counties in which the said national forest is situated: *Provided*, That when any national forest is in more than one State or Territory or county the distributive share to each from the proceeds of said forest shall be proportional to its area therein: *And provided further*, That there shall not be paid to any State or Territory for any county an amount equal to more than 40 per cent of the total income of such county from all other sources.

Mr. ALDRICH. As I understand it, this is a provision which has been alluded to on several occasions, particularly by the Senator from Wyoming, as being the existing law. It seems to me that this was in the last agricultural appropriation act, and it is now proposed to be stricken out of this bill.

Mr. PROCTOR. It is already the law. That is the reason why it is stricken out. The Comptroller holds that it is already the law. I will read from the appropriation act of last year the provision which provides for the 10 per cent.

Mr. FULTON. I ask the Senator if he has any objection to passing over the amendment for the present? I should like to examine it.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think we had better pass over both amendments on the thirty-ninth page, because the next one certainly will lead to discussion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over, and the next amendment on page 39 will also be passed over.

Mr. PROCTOR. The amendment on the next page the committee withdraws. I think there will be no discussion on that.

Mr. HEYBURN. I ask what amendment is withdrawn?

Mr. PROCTOR. The one striking out. If the Senator is not satisfied to-morrow that it is already law, we will consider it again; but I am very sure it is. I know the Comptroller holds that it is already law.

The next amendment, on page 39, line 18, was, after the word "forests," to insert "and hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may divide all lands in national forests into such specific national forests as he may deem best from time to time for administrative purposes, and give to each such name as may be convenient;" and in line 22, after the word "and," to insert "hereafter;" so as read:

To ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests; and hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may divide all lands in national forests into such specific national forests as he may deem best from time to time for administrative purposes, and give to each such name as may be convenient; and hereafter the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests of the United States, etc.

Mr. HEYBURN. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Vermont as to the proposed disposition of the amendment on line 18, down to line 22, page 39?

Mr. ALDRICH. I understood the Senator from Vermont to say that it was withdrawn.

Mr. HEYBURN. That is what I supposed.

Mr. PROCTOR. That is a matter of convenience. Of course that can be done by the President, but it is throwing upon him matter of detail, which more properly belongs to the Department. It is not a matter of any particular consequence, but it is in the interest of proper administration merely.

Mr. HEYBURN. Mr. President, being somewhat familiar with these subjects, I would say to the Senator from Vermont that it is one of the most far-reaching and possibly expensive amendments in this bill. It is an amendment that may devote a vast sum of money to the administration of the forest reserves, and, when it is reached for consideration, I will very briefly point out wherein it is the most subtle and dangerous amendment that we have yet reached. It would enable the Forestry Service to divide up the forest reserves into an infinite number of administrations.

Mr. KEAN. I suppose to be called by name.

Mr. HEYBURN. Yes; by merely dividing them up and naming them, each of them carrying complete administrative powers with it. The object is in order that they may multiply the offices in the field and subdivide the administration in Washington, and add infinitely to the expense of the Forest Reserve Service.

Mr. PROCTOR. As I said, it is a matter of administration. It is now in the power of the President to create these districts, and it is merely a convenience of administration. If it meets the objection of the Senator from Idaho, the committee will withdraw the amendment.

Mr. HEYBURN. It certainly will meet not only with my objection, but that of a number of Senators who have discussed it.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. HALE. It has been withdrawn.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is disagreed to.

Mr. HEYBURN. It is withdrawn.

Mr. KEAN. It is disagreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. The striking out is agreed to, subject to any revision to-morrow.

Mr. CARTER. I understand the amendment referred to has been withdrawn. I desire to direct attention—

Mr. HEYBURN. I think the Record will show that the amendment was withdrawn.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment was disagreed to. Mr. HEYBURN. I beg the pardon of the Chair. I misunderstood the expression.

Mr. CARTER. I desire to call the attention of the chairman of the committee to the word "hereafter," in line 22 on page 39.

Mr. ALDRICH. I think that had better be passed over. I certainly should like to have the provisions in lines 22, 23, 24, and 25 of the bill explained. I think it had better be passed over, because there may be some contention in regard to it.

Mr. CARTER. I think it is very proper to have the entire matter explained, but its effect is to make this particular provision permanent law and provide for the unlimited exportation of timber from one State to another regardless of local needs. I hope the chairman of the committee will pass that over.

Mr. PROCTOR. Let the provision go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The reading will proceed.

Mr. CARTER. To and including the word "situated," in line 2, page 40.

Mr. PATTERSON. Is the amendment that consists of striking out line 3 to line 16 on page 39 passed over?

Mr. PROCTOR. That has been agreed to subject to a change to-morrow, provided it is not settled to the satisfaction of the Senator from Rhode Island that it is already a law. The reason for striking it out was that it was enacted as permanent law last year.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would state that the part stricken out was passed over subject to further consideration. The committee amendment on line 22, after the word "and," to insert the word "hereafter," is passed over.

Mr. CARTER. The entire paragraph is passed over to the word "situated," in line 2, page 40. The House provision is likewise included in the right of amendment.

The next amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 40, line 8, after the date "1908," to insert:

And hereafter all moneys received as contributions toward cooperative work in forest investigations and in the protection and improvement of the national forests shall be covered into the Treasury and shall constitute a special fund, which is hereby appropriated and made available until expended as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, for the payment of the expenses of said investigation, protection, and improvement by the Forest Service, and for refunds to the contributors of amounts heretofore or hereafter paid in by them in excess of their share of the cost of said investigations, protection, and improvement.

Mr. ALDRICH. Let that amendment go over.

Mr. KEAN. Let it go over.

Mr. PROCTOR. That the committee withdraws.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was rejected.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Chair would suggest that in his opinion the committee amendment can not be withdrawn except by unanimous consent. The amendment is disagreed to.

Mr. CARTER. Before that amendment is disposed of finally I wish to call attention to the peculiarities of the amendment. The Senator from Indiana [Mr. HEMENWAY] this afternoon suggested that the last appropriation act provided that after the fiscal year 1907 or the beginning of 1908 detailed estimates should be submitted to Congress. It is contended that that is now the law. This bill as it came from the House contemplated such results. I have no doubt this particular language was inserted at the request of some one from the Forestry Bureau. I have no idea whatever that any member of the committee originated the amendment. Yet the effect of the amendment would inevitably be to repeal the law providing for the submission of estimates. It does appear like an effort to evade the jurisdiction of Congress in the making of appropriations. I think it well for the committee hereafter to scrutinize proposed amendments along this line.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The next amendment was, on page 40, line 22, after the word "forest," to insert "and in conducting experiments and investigations in the city of Washington and elsewhere."

Mr. CARTER. I should like to have the chairman explain what that means.

Mr. PROCTOR. The Comptroller holds that that is necessary. It is inserted in all similar appropriations for other bureaus.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. CARTER. Let the amendment go over.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. Without objection, the amendment will be passed over.

Mr. ALDRICH. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what the meaning is in lines 4, 5, and 6, on page 41, "to collate, digest, report, illustrate, and print the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service." Does this authorize the Forest Reserve Bureau to establish a printing office? I should suppose it did.

Mr. PROCTOR. No, Mr. President, nothing of the kind. The printing, under the law, is done at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. ALDRICH. Under the law; but does not this repeal or modify that law?

Mr. PROCTOR. Oh, no; nothing of the kind, Mr. President.

Mr. ALDRICH. I am not so sure about that myself. I think authority to print results of experiments and investigations might be to establish a printing office. Still I will not press the point.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Secretary will continue the reading of the bill.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 8, after the word "fixtures," to insert "and;" in the same line, after the word "books," to insert "and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington;" and in line 13, before the word "hundred," to strike out "fifty-seven thousand three" and insert "fifty-six thousand eight;" so as to read:

To purchase law books to an amount not exceeding \$500, necessary supplies, apparatus, office fixtures, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington; and to pay freight, express, telegraph, and telephone charges, and for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, washing towels, and traveling and other necessary expenses, \$756,800, of which sum not to exceed \$40,000 may be used for rent.

The amendment was agreed to.

The next amendment was, on page 41, line 24, to increase the total appropriation for salaries and general expenses, Forest Service, from \$899,000 to \$900,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PROCTOR. Now I think we have reached the disputed territory, and I see no occasion to proceed any farther to-night, unless the Senate is prepared for another hour's session.

Mr. ALDRICH. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

Mr. McCUMBER. Will the Senator withhold that for a few moments that I may submit some reports from the Committee on Pensions for consideration?

Mr. ALDRICH. I withhold the motion.

WILLIAM T. COOPER.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7283) granting an increase of pension to William T. Cooper, to report it with an amendment, and I submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "sixty" and insert "thirty;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of William T. Cooper, late of Company G, Fourth Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JAMES P. WORRELL.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8314) granting a pension to James P. Worrell, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, before the word "Company," to strike out "of" and insert "captain;" in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "forty" and insert "thirty;" and in the same line, after the word "month," to insert "in lieu of that he is now receiving;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to

the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of James P. Worrell, late captain Company B, Eighty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting an increase of pension to James P. Worrell."

GEORGE E. PURDY.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 7993) granting an increase of pension to George E. Purdy, to report it with an amendment, and I submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment, in line 8, before the word "dollars," to strike out "fifty" and insert "twenty-four;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of George E. Purdy, late of Company G, One hundred and twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MIRANDA W. HOWARD.

Mr. McCUMBER. I am directed by the Committee on Pensions, to whom was referred the bill (S. 8508) granting an increase of pension to Miranda W. Howard, to report it with amendments, and I submit a report thereon. I ask for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported from the Committee on Pensions with amendments, in line 6, after the word "of," to strike out "Company B, Twenty-first Regiment, and;" and in line 8, after the word "Infantry," to insert "Twenty-fourth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps;" so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, the name of Miranda W. Howard, widow of Seaver Howard, late of Company D, Seventeenth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, Twenty-fourth Company, Second Battalion Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$16 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROSEBUD INDIAN RESERVATION LANDS.

Mr. GAMBLE, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to whom was referred the bill (S. 6618) to authorize the sale of a portion of the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in South Dakota, and for other purposes, reported it with an amendment, and submitted a report thereon.

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. KEAN. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened, and (at 6 o'clock and 13 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, February 19, at 11 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate February 18, 1907.

COLLECTORS OF CUSTOMS.

William J. Grant, of New York, to be collector of customs for the district of Cape Vincent, in the State of New York.

Floyd Hughes, of Virginia, to be collector of customs for the district of Norfolk and Portsmouth, in the State of Virginia.

POSTMASTERS.

CONNECTICUT.

Harvey S. Abel to be postmaster at Stafford Springs, in the county of Tolland and State of Connecticut.

Aaron S. Chapman to be postmaster at Simsbury, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Ira E. Hicks to be postmaster at New Britain, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Charles A. Keyes to be postmaster at Southington, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Roswell A. Moore to be postmaster at Kensington, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Jessie S. Rose to be postmaster at Manchester, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Frederick L. Scott to be postmaster at Farmington, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

Thomas Walker to be postmaster at Plantsville, in the county of Hartford and State of Connecticut.

ILLINOIS.

Henry Brandon to be postmaster at Albion, in the county of Edwards and State of Illinois.

Henry K. Brockway to be postmaster at Barrington, in the county of Cook and State of Illinois.

Arthur P. Woodruff to be postmaster at Savanna, in the county of Carroll and State of Illinois.

INDIANA.

Martin A. Miser to be postmaster at Waterloo, in the county of Dekalb and State of Indiana.

KANSAS.

Jacob D. Hirschler to be postmaster at Hillsboro, in the county of Marion and State of Kansas.

MASSACHUSETTS.

John S. Fay to be postmaster at Marlboro, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

Charles A. Perley to be postmaster at Baldwinville, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Charles L. Stevens to be postmaster at Clinton, in the county of Worcester and State of Massachusetts.

Charles J. Wood to be postmaster at Natick, in the county of Middlesex and State of Massachusetts.

MINNESOTA.

Carl S. Eastwood to be postmaster at Heron Lake, in the county of Jackson and State of Minnesota.

MISSOURI.

Otto K. Benecke to be postmaster at Brunswick, in the county of Chariton and State of Missouri.

George T. Dummire to be postmaster at Kennett, in the county of Dunklin and State of Missouri.

T. B. Morris to be postmaster at Hannibal, in the county of Marion and State of Missouri.

NEVADA.

Callie B. Ferguson to be postmaster at Fallon, in the county of Churchill and State of Nevada.

NEW HAMPSHIRE.

Natt A. Cram to be postmaster at Pittsfield, in the county of Merrimack and State of New Hampshire.

NEW JERSEY.

Joseph Miller to be postmaster at Salem, in the county of Salem and State of New Jersey.

NEW YORK.

W. Seward Whittlesey to be postmaster at Rochester, in the county of Monroe and State of New York.

Clarence E. Wiggins to be postmaster at Cape Vincent, in the county of Jefferson and State of New York.

OREGON.

James L. Page to be postmaster at Eugene, in the county of Lane and State of Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Harry B. Heywood to be postmaster at Conshohocken, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

John H. Mailey to be postmaster at Northumberland, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

Daniel O. Merrick to be postmaster at Blossburg, in the county of Tioga and State of Pennsylvania.

William W. Scott to be postmaster at Sewickley, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

Elsie Shrodes to be postmaster at Oakdale, in the county of Allegheny and State of Pennsylvania.

SOUTH DAKOTA.

John H. Dodson to be postmaster at Alexandria, in the county of Hanson and State of South Dakota.

Evan J. Edwards to be postmaster at Bowdle, in the county of Edmunds and State of South Dakota.

Elmer E. Gilmore to be postmaster at Lennox, in the county of Lincoln and State of South Dakota.

Fred deK. Griffin to be postmaster at Selby, in the county of Walworth and State of South Dakota.

John B. Long to be postmaster at Kimball, in the county of Brule and State of South Dakota.

John W. Walsh to be postmaster at Montrose, in the county of McCook and State of South Dakota.

TEXAS.

W. G. McClain to be postmaster at Waxahachie, in the county of Ellis and State of Texas.

UTAH.

Adolph Hanson to be postmaster at Ephraim, in the county of Sanpete and State of Utah.

WASHINGTON.

Sarah E. Truax to be postmaster at Tekoa, in the county of Whitman and State of Washington.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, February 18, 1907.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, there is a bill which has been referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, H. R. 25694. This bill, which was first referred to the Rivers and Harbors Committee, was afterwards introduced by me as a perfected bill by direction of that committee and should go to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the change of reference will be made.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 4403) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved March 3, 1903.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 21579) granting an increase of pension to Sarah R. Harrington.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 275. An act to divide the State of Oregon into two judicial districts.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendment of the House to the bill (S. 1726) making provision for conveying in fee the piece or strip of ground in St. Augustine, Fla., known as "The Lines," for school purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bills of the following titles:

H. R. 14361. An act granting an honorable discharge to David Harrington;

H. R. 17875. An act waiving the age limit for admission to the Pay Corps of the United States Navy in the case of W. W. Peirce;

H. R. 18924. An act for the relief of George M. Esterly;

H. R. 23284. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia,' regulating proceedings for condemnation of land for streets;"

H. R. 24821. An act to authorize the Georgia Southwestern and Gulf Railroad Company to construct a bridge across the Chattahoochee River between the States of Alabama and Georgia;

H. R. 24989. An act to provide for the commutation for town-site purposes of homestead entries in certain portions of Oklahoma;

H. R. 25366. An act to authorize the New Orleans and Great Northern Railroad Company to construct a bridge across Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi; and

H. R. 25046. An act to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River at Louisiana, Mo.